

tion since the World War, if the Japanese military leaders had not long been convinced that Senator Nye, of North Dakota, represented the true American attitude, if they had not believed that the numerically insignificant group of peace-at-any-price pacifists constituted a true cross section of American public opinion, if the Japanese Ambassador in Washington had not been misled by certain senatorial back-door callers, who assured him that, no matter what happened, the United States would not fight.

Mr. President, who is the Member of the Senate who has been constituting himself a back-door caller at the Embassy of the Japanese Government? Who have been the visitors at the Japanese Embassy tipping off the Ambassador from that little land to the fact that the United States would not fight Japan under any circumstances? Who are they? The Senate has a right to know, and I should like with all my heart to see the Senate demand that the editor of the Chicago Daily News make known who those Senators are. They do not exist. They existed only at that moment in the mind of the editor of the Chicago Daily News, who was bent, as others were bent at that moment and since, upon the one cause of undermining the confidence of the American people in any and all persons who dared to criticize what they feared to be a course that was contrary to American wishes and American interests.

The concluding paragraph of this editorial is as follows:

Now we must pay the penalty for this misrepresentation. It may not be actual resort to arms. But it does necessitate the strongest possible measures to convince the Japanese of their error. President Roosevelt indicated clearly his appreciation of the gravity of the situation by addressing his demands directly to the Emperor. He may find it necessary to withdraw our Ambassador and give Saito his passports, thus breaking off relations in order to bring home to the war-drunk militarists of Japan the actualities of the crisis they have deliberately precipitated. Let there be no further mistake by Nye and his followers. In whatever the President does to maintain American self-respect and the respect of other nations he will have the overwhelming support of the Nation.

Mr. President, there was excellent warning for one day at least as to what might be expected of those who would to the last ditch fight against our country participating in another foreign engagement, at least until we could have some little measure of assurance at another time that in addition to helping other nations with their wars we would have some voice in determining the peace; that in addition to winning the war we could win at least one of the causes which at the moment we might declare was responsible for our participation in the war.

I am satisfied that there is a sufficiently large element in the United States today which is acquainted with or is acquainting itself with the experiences of other days, and which is strong enough to prevent the effort that is being made today to shape the American mind for war. I am sure that element possesses sufficient strength to resist and to prevent us from proceeding in the direction which some few would have us go.

In light of past experiences, Mr. President, and in spite of the world conditions prevalent today, I do not believe it is going to be possible to change the determination of the American public to stay at home and mind our own business, and, while providing ourselves with an adequate national defense, to quit this game of providing the kind of defense which contemplates naval excursions around the earth, naval visitations to other quarters of the earth, at the same time being able successfully to meet any emergency that may arise or that may challenge us anywhere upon this globe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hughes in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not insist upon the adoption of that amendment tonight.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from North Dakota thinks, does he not, that other Senators will want to speak on the bill?

Mr. NYE. Yes; Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Senator's suggestion is a reasonable one.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate take a recess under the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 25, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Thursday, April 21 (legislative day of April 20), 1938

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Paul B. Witmer, of California, to be register of the land office at Los Angeles, Calif. Reappointment.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dr. Lloyd D. Felton to be senior surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

Asst. Dental Sur. (R) George E. Waterman to be assistant dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Boatswain Page R. Loyd to be a chief boatswain, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Boatswain (L) William E. Crapo to be a chief boatswain (L), to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Radio Electrician Miles W. Hopkins to be a chief radio electrician, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist John R. Cody to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist William E. Shipway to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist James Madole to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist Walter W. Bond to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist Clarence C. Alexander to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Machinist Herman H. Ternau to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

Pay Clerk Howard R. Pickering to be a chief pay clerk, to rank as such from February 15, 1938.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most merciful Heavenly Father, help us to begin this day with the right spirit in our hearts—the spirit of love toward Thee and our fellow men. We pray that we may be ever mindful of what we owe Thee, our friends, ourselves, and our country. Unfettered by unholy passions and free from the spirit of unforgiveness, oh, let us feel the unity of the bonds of brotherhood. May we give praise and thanksgiving to that ageless song: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." We beseech Thee that these may be the days of the high tides of cooperation and mutual understanding, when the streams of thought and wisdom shall flow from all lips. O God, if pride or presumption imperil and vision becomes distressful, oh, take our wills and help them to pass into an assured reasonableness and peace which form the strength of life. In the holy name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9257. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.;

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution providing an additional appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3590. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to make available certain other officers for General Staff duty.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. FRAZIER and Mr. DAVIS members on the part of the Senate of the Special Joint Congressional Committee to Investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority, as provided for in Public Resolution No. 83, approved April 4, 1938, superseding Messrs. McNARY and BORAH, resigned.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9621) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments: The Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Interior, Post Office Department, Works Progress Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 268

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

MINORITY REPORT

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a minority report on behalf of myself and other Members on the bill S. 5, to prevent the adulteration, misbranding, and false advertisement of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics in interstate, foreign, and other commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for the purposes of safeguarding the public health, preventing deceit upon the purchasing public, and for other purposes, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 9621, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado when this conference report will be considered?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think next Tuesday.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very much interested in a Senate amendment. It will not be considered this week?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Colorado if he has filed a committee report with this conference report to be printed?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. May we have the opportunity to file a minority report?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Personally, I do not know. I did not know the gentleman wanted to file a minority report.

Mr. RICH. I should like to file a minority report and have it printed with the conference report the gentleman is now offering the House.

Mr. WOODRUM. Of course, this is a conference report. There is no rule which provides for a minority report to be filed with a conference report. The gentleman as a conferee may refuse to sign the conference report.

Mr. RICH. I have refused to sign the conference report, but I would like to give the House a little information.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman may make a big speech here and tell us all about it.

Mr. RICH. When you make a speech to the House of Representatives, unless you are in favor of spending and continuing to flounder the Treasury, it does not carry much weight in this House. All the Members of the House want to do is to squander Government funds. The Members are not interested in listening to someone who wants to economize.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would suggest the gentleman ask unanimous consent to file a report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9544) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9544) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 12, 13, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25, 32, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, and 58, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That 5 per centum of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures in the various offices and divisions named, but not more than 5 per centum shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said offices or divisions and any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or the head of the division"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$430,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,634,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,010,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,191,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used to pay the compensation of any person hereafter employed as an attorney unless such person shall be duly licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,758,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,249,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"No part of the funds herein appropriated for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce shall be used to pay the salary of any employee or officer, other than the Director and Assistant Directors, engaged on regular work of the Bureau within the continental limits of the United States, for a period longer than three consecutive months, at an annual rate in excess of \$7,000 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "of which sum \$7,440 shall be available for temporary employees"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LXXXIII—355

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "of which \$50,000 shall be used for increased compensation to persons receiving less than \$2,000 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 15, and 51.

THOS. S. McMILLAN,
M. C. TARTER,
JAMES McANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MILLARD CALDWELL,
ROBERT L. BACON

(Except as to amendment 34).

ALBERT E. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
R. B. RUSSELL, JR.,
PAT MCCARRAN,
KEY PITTMAN,
FREDERICK HALE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 9544, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

State Department

On amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$5,588 for the Permanent Association of International Road Congresses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$588, as provided by the House, of which amount \$5,000 is available for participation in meetings of the association on the part of the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 2: Corrects a total.

On amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$25,000 for fence construction on the Arizona-Mexico boundary under the administration of the Mexican Boundary Commission instead of \$50,000, as provided in the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 4: Corrects punctuation.

Department of Justice

On amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$566,070 for salaries in the Administrative Division, Office of the Attorney General, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$559,300, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 6: Corrects a total.

On amendment No. 7: Makes the amount that may be transferred among the various divisions and offices under the Office of the Attorney General not to exceed 5 percent. This compares with the Senate action striking out all authority for transfers and the House action in permitting transfers up to 10 percent.

On amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$185,000 for expenses of the Bond and Spirits Division instead of \$165,000, as proposed by the House and \$203,000 as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 9: Exempts the head of the Bond and Spirits Division from civil-service requirements, as proposed by the Senate, but eliminates language inserted by the Senate which would have required confirmation by the Senate and Presidential appointment.

On amendment No. 10: Restores the 10 percent transfer authority among certain appropriations under the Bureau of Prisons which had been eliminated by the Senate.

On amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$430,660 for salaries, United States Supreme Court, instead of \$426,100 as proposed by the House and \$431,110 as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 12: Puts reimbursements from District of Columbia funds for percentage costs of expenses of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on a basis of expenditures as proposed by the House, instead of appropriations, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 13: Same as amendment No. 12.

On amendment No. 16: Makes appropriation for United States Court for China available for expenses connected with travel of officers and employees of the court and of their dependents, while en route to or from places of temporary refuge in time of war, or other emergency.

On amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$3,634,440 for salaries and expenses of marshals and their deputies, instead of \$3,594,440, as provided by the House and \$3,639,440 as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$3,010,000 for salaries and expenses of district attorneys and their assistants, instead of \$2,990,940, as proposed by the House and \$3,025,000 as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$2,191,140 for salaries and expenses of clerks of courts, instead of \$2,179,800, as proposed by the House and \$2,219,800 as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$737,650 for salaries of officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$731,970, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: Amends the limitation prohibiting the use of any funds appropriated in the act for the Department of Justice to pay the compensation of any person as an attorney unless such person shall be duly licensed to practice as an attorney under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, by making it apply only to those hereafter employed as an attorney instead of eliminating the limitation entirely, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 22: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to permit title 2 of the bill to be cited as an act.

Department of Commerce

On amendment No. 23: Authorizes \$6,000 of the appropriation for traveling expenses to be available for hire of automobiles for travel on official business, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$650,000 for departmental salaries, Bureau of Air Commerce, as proposed by the House, instead of \$625,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 25: Makes appropriations for establishment of air navigation facilities, Bureau of Air Commerce, available for purchase of an automobile, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$4,575,000 for establishment of air navigation facilities, Bureau of Air Commerce, instead of \$4,463,500, as provided by the House, and \$4,713,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 27: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate to authorize additional contractual authority for air navigation aids, Bureau of Air Commerce.

On amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$6,758,680 for maintenance of air navigation facilities, Bureau of Air Commerce, instead of \$6,726,400, as provided by the House, and \$6,792,400, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 29: Restores House limitation of \$10,000 on use of aircraft in commerce appropriations, Bureau of Air Commerce, for purchase of automobiles, instead of \$5,000 limitation, proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,249,800 for aircraft in commerce, Bureau of Air Commerce, instead of \$1,232,300, as proposed by the House, and \$1,267,300, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$258,000, as provided by the House, for safety in planning, Bureau of Air Commerce, instead of \$240,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 32: Modifies provision appertaining to use of Bureau of Air Commerce appropriations for transporting household effects of employees to limit weight in any one case to 6,000 pounds net weight when shipped without packing, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$323,000 for expenses of district and cooperative offices, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as proposed by the House, instead of \$285,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 34: Amends a limitation inserted by the Senate affecting certain salaries and personnel in the Department of Commerce by making limitation applicable to only the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and inhibiting the payment of any salaries therein in excess of \$7,000 under certain conditions and with certain exceptions.

On amendment No. 35: Limits amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia in custom statistics work, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to \$100,000, instead of \$87,880, as provided by the House, and \$120,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$143,800, as proposed by the House, for transportation of families and effects of officers and employees and allowance of living quarters, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, instead of \$160,525, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 37: Eliminates Senate language proposing to make \$16,725 of the appropriation for transportation of families and effects of officers and employees and allowances for living quarters available to furnish quarters allowance in foreign posts for clerks.

On amendment No. 38: Agrees to Senate language technically rewording limitation on amount available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the promotion of foreign and domestic commerce and expenses of illustrating the work of the Bureau at such meetings.

On amendment No. 39: Same as amendment No. 38.

On amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$80,000 for expenses of furnishing old-age information, Bureau of the Census, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$2,322,000 for salaries and general expenses, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,202,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$130,000 for departmental salaries, Bureau of Lighthouses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$125,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 43: Amends Senate language which proposed to make appropriation for departmental salaries, Bureau of

Lighthouses, available for certain specified temporary positions, by eliminating the naming of such specified positions and making a lump sum available for temporary employees.

On amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$2,332,000 for salaries, light-house vessels, Bureau of Lighthouses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,302,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 45: Makes appropriation for field expenses, coastal surveys, Coast and Geodetic Survey, available for employment in the field and office of two physicists, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 46: Restores appropriation of \$64,550 for magnetic and seismological work, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and makes \$4,550 of such appropriation available for resurvey of San Andreas fault line, both of which were provided by the House, instead of appropriating \$60,000 and eliminating the aforementioned survey, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$582,000 for pay of officers and men on vessels, Coast and Geodetic Survey, as proposed by the House, instead of \$554,500 as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$580,000 for departmental salaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey, as proposed by the House, instead of \$570,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$962,000 for propagation of food fishes, Bureau of Fisheries, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,002,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 50: Eliminates Senate language proposing to make appropriation for propagation of food fishes, Bureau of Fisheries, available in the amount of \$40,000 to acquire fish cultural stations in Oklahoma.

On amendment No. 52: Inserts Senate limitation of \$67,000 on pay of permanent employees, fishery industries, Bureau of Fisheries, instead of \$60,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$83,600 for fishery industries, Bureau of Fisheries, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$73,600, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 54: Corrects punctuation.

Department of Labor

On amendment No. 55: Makes appropriation for families, field service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, available in the amount of \$50,000, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for increase in salaries of employees receiving less than \$2,000 per annum.

On amendment No. 56: Corrects punctuation.

On amendment No. 57: Amends a limitation, the effect of which is to require officers and employees of the United States appropriated for in the act to be citizens of the United States, by exempting persons in the service of the United States on the date of the approval of the act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen, or who owed allegiance to the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 58: Further limits the subject matter of amendment No. 57 by providing that the limitation shall not apply to the employment of interpreters in the Immigration and Naturalization Service (not to exceed 10 permanent employees and such temporary employees as are required from time to time) where competent citizen interpreters are not available, as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments No. 14 and No. 15 relating to pay of certain employees of the District Court, Panama Canal Zone, Department of Justice and amendment No. 51 relating to appropriation for construction of fish screens and their installation on certain property, under the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce.

THOS. S. McMILLAN,

M. C. TARVER,

JAMES MCANDREWS,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,

MILLARD CALDWELL,

ROBERT L. BACON,

(Except as to amendment No. 34),

ALBERT E. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Before we take up the amendments in disagreement, Mr. Speaker, I think I should call the House's attention to the fact that the bill is over \$1,000,000 less than the Budget estimates. The total appropriation carried in the bill is \$130,825,300, which is \$313,585 in excess of the amount carried when the bill originally passed the House.

For the purposes of the Record the following statement indicates a comparison of the appropriations for each of the four Departments carried in this bill with the appropriations for the current year and the estimates for 1939:

	Appropriations for 1938	Estimates for 1939	Amount rec- ommended in bill for 1939	Increase(+) or decrease (-) bill compared with 1938 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-) bill compared with 1939 estimates
State Department.....	\$19,340,713.34	\$17,017,970.73	\$16,663,750	-\$2,676,933.34	-\$354,220.73
Justice Department.....	41,487,330.00	43,667,761.00	42,404,265	+916,935.00	-1,263,496.00
Commerce Department.....	43,388,342.00	46,782,720.00	47,424,335	+4,035,993.00	+841,615.00
Labor Department.....	23,681,920.00	24,445,760.00	24,332,950	+651,030.00	-112,810.00
Grand total.....	127,898,305.34	131,914,211.73	130,825,300	+2,926,994.66	-1,088,911.73

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 51, line 4, strike out "\$44,812" and insert "\$46,085."

Mr. McMILLAN: Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 15: Page 51, line 4, after the figures "\$46,085", insert "together with not to exceed \$1,500 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1938, and such amount shall be available to pay additional compensation to the following officials of the court for the fiscal year 1938: District attorney, \$500; assistant district attorney, \$250; marshal, \$500; deputy marshal, \$250: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1939 the compensation of the court officials named shall be at the rates as follows: District attorney, \$5,500; assistant district attorney, \$4,050; marshal, \$5,500; deputy marshal, \$3,125."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me about 3 minutes?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under the statutes the salaries of these officials, which this law attempts to raise, are subject to being fixed by the President of the United States. That is the way the law is drawn at present. It is different from the Classification Act.

This amendment attempts to change the salaries in cases where the President has refused to grant certain increases. On top of that it dates these increases back to the 1st of July 1937. I do not like that way of doing business. Frankly, I believe that when we set up a certain method of handling salaries and increases, that method should be adhered to. I do not believe in increasing salaries and dating the increase back to a period more than 9 months prior to the time when the raise takes effect.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not agree to this amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to which the gentleman from New York objects does not propose to date back extra compensation for the officials named in the amendment. There was some discussion of this matter when the bill originally passed the House, and the gentleman from New York then raised a point of order against this provision, which had been reported to the House by the House committee.

Last year when we passed the appropriation bill of the Department of Justice for this fiscal year 1938, the House made provision for these so-called retroactive increases. In other words, the House made provision for these exact increases in the salaries of these officials, beginning July 1, 1937. Its action in so doing was prospective and not retroactive. The attention of neither the committee nor the House at that time was called to a peculiar circumstance

with regard to this court, in that as originally created and before it was transferred to its present status as a Federal court provision was made for the fixing of the salaries of these officials by the President. For that reason, the increases which the committee and the Congress sought to provide for these officials and which, according to the evidence before our committee, were amply deserved and sufficed to make them somewhat in line with the salaries of similar officials in other United States courts, were not made effective and these officials did not receive the increases in salary for which the Congress had provided. Therefore, when we began to formulate the bill for the fiscal year 1939 we sought to place in the bill language which would assure these officials the benefit of the increases which had been intended by the Congress. This language was stricken out on a point of order raised in the House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] but was reinserted in the Senate.

The President has never passed on this question one way or the other, as far as I am advised. There is no question here of overriding Presidential action, because there has been no Presidential action. There is simply an effort by the committees of the House and Senate who have heard the evidence relating to this matter to afford these employees salaries commensurate with the duties they perform and comparable to the salaries received by similar officials in other courts of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I call the gentleman's attention to this language:

And such amount shall be available to pay additional compensation to the following officials of the court for the fiscal year 1938.

Does this not carry the increases in salaries back to July 1, 1937? According to my understanding, it does.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently did not clearly understand my attempted explanation. We appropriated these same amounts last year, the increases to be effective July 1, 1937, for these officials for the present fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. I understand that.

Mr. TARVER. They expected to receive it. It was provided by Congress. This is simply a reappropriation of what we have already provided for their benefit.

Mr. TABER. That is true, but the President failed to put into effect the increase he had the authority to allow.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman stated the President had denied the increase.

Mr. TABER. No; he failed to put it into effect.

Mr. TARVER. As far as I am advised, the President has not passed upon the matter one way or the other, but the committees have passed on the matter on the evidence they had before them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 67, noes 20.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51: On page 93, after the period in line 8 insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Construction of fish screens: For construction, operation, and maintenance, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, of fish screens and ladders on Federal irrigation projects, \$20,000, of which not to exceed \$6,400 may be expended for the pay of employees engaged in the conduct of investigations and surveys, the preparation of designs, and the supervision of construction, in connection with such screens and ladders."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of all of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"Construction of fish screens: For construction, operation, and maintenance, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or either, of fish screens and ladders on Federal irrigation projects, and for the conduct of investigations and surveys, the preparation of designs, and supervision of construction of such screens and ladders; and for determining the requirements for fishways and other fish protective devices at dams constructed under licenses issued by the Federal Power Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act (16 U. S. C. 791), \$20,000, of which not to exceed \$6,400 may be expended for the pay of permanent employees."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I may say this word in explanation.

The Senate amendment provided for this cooperation between the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Reclamation in the matter of installing screens to protect fish life. This amendment merely extends that same measure of cooperation to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in addition to the Bureau of Reclamation, and permits studies and work to be undertaken respecting fish conservation in connection with projects licensed by the Federal Power Commission.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8993) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8993) "making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 39, 43, 44, 45, and 46.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 20, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 42, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$35,457,649"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,716,318"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "except not more than one officer of the rank of rear admiral"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed insert "\$47,368,478"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$176,841,282"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$200,940,752"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS"

"For the procurement and transportation of strategic and critical materials, \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That materials acquired hereunder shall not be issued for current use in time of peace without the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, except that materials acquired under this title may be issued for current use when replaced by materials purchased from current appropriations: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of the Navy shall determine what materials are strategic and critical."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
DAVID I. WALSH,
FREDERICK HALE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8993) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 28, 31, 32, 39, 43, and 46, relating to limitations upon expenditures for pay of Group IV-B employees: Restores the arrangement of such limitations in the bill as proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to the appropriation "Maintenance and repairs, Naval Academy": Appropriates \$1,062,566, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,073,816, as proposed by the Senate, and makes immediately available the amount of \$14,000 proposed by the House for the provision of an additional well, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, relating to flight pay of officers: Limits the number of officers of flag rank who might draw flying pay to one, instead of two, as proposed by the House, and none, as proposed by the Senate. The one is intended to be the incumbent of the office of Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. This action details a lesser appropriation by \$4,000 than proposed by the House, and a greater appropriation, by a like amount, than proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 20: Corrects the spelling of a word.

On amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26, relating to the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel": Eliminates the increase of \$317,248 proposed by the Senate for pay, subsistence, and transportation for an average increase of 5,285 enlisted men, thus maintaining the increase at the average number of 5,050, proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 24 and 27: Changes totals to conform with action touching officer and enlisted personnel.

On amendment No. 29: Broadens source of income from sales, with view to augmenting capital of Naval Supply Account Fund, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$500,000 for the procurement of strategic and critical materials, instead of \$3,000,000, as proposed by the House. The Senate proposed no appropriation.

On amendment No. 33: Provides for the procurement of 11 passenger-carrying automobiles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 10, as proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38, relating to Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Raises the cost of the storehouse at the Mare Island Navy Yard from \$500,000, as proposed by the House, to the authorized limit of \$800,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that the appropriation proposed by the House for dredging at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, shall be available for dredging in the fourteenth naval district, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$40,000 for officers' quarters at the Naval Station, Balboa, Canal Zone, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$120,000 for officers' quarters at the submarine base, Coco Solo, Canal Zone, to cost in all \$360,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 40, 41, and 42, relating to the Marine Corps: Provides for continuation of existing limitation upon em-

ployment of enlisted men at Marine Corps Headquarters, as proposed by the Senate, instead of providing for ultimate discontinuance of the practice, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$2,400,000 under the miscellaneous subhead of the appropriation "General Expenses, Marine Corps," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,385,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 44 and 45, relating to "Replacement of Naval Vessels": Appropriates \$117,363,150 under the "Construction and machinery" subhead, as proposed by the House, instead of \$119,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision proposed by the House designed to curtail the period following the first commissioning date of new ships during which obligations might be incurred. The limitation is not intended to interfere with expenditures in consequence of properly incurred obligations.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Budget approved estimates for the Navy Department for the fiscal year of 1939 in the sum of \$564,406,461. As passed by the House, the naval appropriation bill carried \$549,195,494. The Senate added items to the bill calling for an addition of \$3,040,348, and it subtracted from our bill in two places a total of \$3,008,000, the net result being an increase of \$32,348 over the amount carried in the House bill.

The Senate has receded from all of its increases but \$175,000, and of its decreases we have accepted \$2,504,000.

Therefore the bill will carry, if you approve this conference report, \$546,866,494, which is \$2,329,000 less than the bill carried as it passed the House, \$2,361,348 less than it carried as it passed the Senate, and \$17,539,967 under the Budget estimate, excluding reappropriations of \$4,071,000.

Taking into account the reappropriations, the bill is still \$13,468,967 below the Budget estimates for 1939, and I might say in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that this is the third successive regular annual appropriation bill for the Navy that I have been able to bring back from conference calling for less money than the bills carried when they left the House.

If there are any questions, I shall be pleased to answer them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when this conference report is disposed of, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] will have finished his responsibilities in connection with the regular annual naval appropriation bills, because, as all of you know, he has announced his intention not to be a candidate for reelection.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this body who will not have a feeling of profound regret that we are to lose Mr. UMSTEAD as a colleague and that we shall not have his wise counsel and leadership as regards financing naval legislation.

Mr. UMSTEAD entered the House at the beginning of the Seventy-third Congress. One term later, at the beginning of the Seventy-fourth Congress, he had the distinction of being assigned to membership on the Committee on Appropriations. Among other assignments on that committee, he was given membership on the subcommittee having charge of appropriations for the Navy Department. After 1 year's service on that subcommittee it devolved upon Mr. UMSTEAD to bring into the House and engineer the passage of the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1937. It will be recalled that the chairman of the subcommittee, the late Hon. Glover H. Cary, was suddenly stricken with an illness from which he never recovered.

The masterful way in which Mr. UMSTEAD stepped into the breach and handled that measure won the respect and admiration of every Member of this House. He there at once demonstrated those qualities which earn Members of this body the confidence and respect of their colleagues and of their country. He was a master of his subject, he knew

whereof he spoke, he was convincing, he was forceful, he was fair, he was gracious, and, above all, he was courteous.

The year following Mr. UMSTEAD succeeded to the chairmanship of the Naval Subcommittee and was responsible in his own right for the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, as he has been for the one now about to become law.

Mr. Speaker, this is the seventeenth annual naval appropriation bill that has been handled by the Committee on Appropriations. Prior to the fiscal year 1922 such bills were under the jurisdiction of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. In those 17 years Mr. UMSTEAD's predecessors as subcommittee chairmen have been the Honorable Patrick J. Kelley, of Michigan; the Honorable Burton L. French, of Idaho; the Honorable William A. Ayres, of Kansas; and the Honorable Glover H. Cary, of Kentucky. Those of you who served here when those distinguished men had charge of appropriations for the Navy know of their high caliber and of the regard and esteem entertained for them by their colleagues without regard to party. In my judgment the roster is enriched by the addition of the name of WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD. [Applause.]

I am sure every one of you regrets as keenly as I do his departure from our midst and join with me in the fervent hope that he and his loved ones may live to enjoy a long and prosperous life. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur very heartily in everything that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has said about Mr. UMSTEAD. I have served on the Appropriations Committee with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, and I have observed, as have other Members, his high sense of duty, his indefatigable application to that duty, his splendid conception of the functions of the Appropriations Committee and its limitations, and his courtesy always to his colleagues. I join with the gentleman from Georgia and the other Members of the House in feeling that Mr. UMSTEAD's leaving this body will be a great loss to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. As one of Mr. UMSTEAD's colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I heartily approve everything that the gentleman from Georgia has said about his service in the House. I feel it is very much to be regretted that a man with his fine sense of honor, good judgment, and ability is going to retire at the end of the present session. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to join, with all the sincerity that is in me, in every compliment that has been paid to our colleague, Mr. UMSTEAD. I have said in other places, and I say it here, that I do not know of a man who has come to this House in the years I have been honored by membership in it, who for the time he has served, has better, if as well, impressed himself upon the membership of this body by his outstanding ability, by his fairness, and by the wonderful character that he exhibits upon all occasions. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be unfaithful to my own feelings and my sense of duty were I not to speak a word in connection with my friend and colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. UMSTEAD, who is to retire from this body at the end of this present term. The things that have been very appropriately said this morning concerning his services, by those from other States, I am sure will be highly appreciated by his friends in North Carolina. Being the dean of the North Carolina delegation in the House of Representatives, and having observed very carefully the men whom our State has sent here since I

have been a Member of this body, as well as those sent here by other States, I am free to say that I have never known a man who has more faithfully, more competently, or more assiduously discharged the duties incumbent upon a Representative in Congress than my beloved colleague from North Carolina, Mr. UMSTEAD, and I am sure that his leaving the House is not only a distinct loss to the House and to the country, but primarily it is a great loss to North Carolina and the North Carolina delegation, and no matter who may succeed him, it will take him years of work to ever equal the services rendered by the gentleman from North Carolina. No one has come from our State since I have been here whose leaving has been a greater loss than that which we feel in the going of our colleague, Mr. UMSTEAD.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I share with deep pride the fine expressions manifested by this House in relation to my beloved colleague Mr. UMSTEAD. Probably I have known him better than anybody else in this House. When I was a judge in North Carolina he came to the bar, and I have observed him for the last 20 years. He has always manifested as a citizen, as a lawyer, and as a public official the same fidelity and exact observance of duty manifested by him since he has been a Member of this House. My State is thrilled with pride, I assure you, in the realization that he has made a reputation such as has brought forth the expressions we have heard from his colleagues here today.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I very deeply appreciate the remarks concerning me and my service here in the House by the distinguished gentlemen who have just spoken.

I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

TIDEWATER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3915) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Tidewater Construction Corporation, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after "act", insert "": And provided further, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$3,900."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

GEORGE SHADE AND VAVA SHADE

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5338) for the relief of George Shade and Vava Shade, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 15, after "Iowa", insert "": Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and

the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

GEORGE W. HALL

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5737) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of George W. Hall against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "act", insert "Provided further, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$15,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

RUTH RULE

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5731) for the relief of Ruth Rule, a minor, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

JOHN CALARESO, A MINOR

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6370) for the relief of John Calareso, a minor, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,075" and insert: "\$1,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

OLD VILLAGE HARBOR AREA OF BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1948) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners within the Old Harbor Village area of Boston, Mass., with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

ROBERTA CARR

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of Roberta Carr, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

HENRY M. HYER

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of Henry M. Hyer, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

W. D. PRESLEY

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2665) for the relief of W. D. Presley, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

MIRIAM GRANT

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6618) for the relief of Miriam Grant, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

WILLIAM R. KELLOGG

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 371) for the relief of William R. Kellogg, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

A. C. WILLIAMS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1043) for the relief of A. C. Williams, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and CARLSON.

CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the conference report on the bill (S. 1882) entitled "An act for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation", and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1882),

entitled "An Act for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

AMEROSE J. KENNEDY,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

L. B. SCHWELLENBACH,
M. M. LOGAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House Committee on Claims recommended the bill to the House in the amount of \$92,993.40, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for additional costs incurred by such corporation in the performance of a contract with the Department of War. This is the amount for which the Senate passed the bill. An amendment was offered on the floor of the House reducing the amount from \$92,993.40 to \$75,805.34. This amendment was accepted by the House.

At the conference the House conferees receded from the amendment of the House and the original amount of \$92,993.40 was agreed upon by the conferees.

AMEROSE J. KENNEDY,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point by inserting my statement made before the House Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FULLER BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. FULLER. I have a bill pending before this committee, known as H. R. 9701, providing for reservoirs at Beaver and Wild Cat Shoals on White River; at Norfolk on the North Fork River; and near Lone Rock on the Buffalo River, all in the Ozark Mountains in northwest Arkansas. These reservoirs to be built for the dual purpose of power and flood control. From the report of the Army engineers, while Beaver could be used for both purposes, its primary purpose was considered more as a reservoir and the engineers have made no detailed report upon this project.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has endorsed Norfolk and Lone Rock. In Committee Document No. 1, known as a Comprehensive Flood Control Plan for the Ohio and Lower Mississippi Rivers, Norfolk and Lone Rock are both included, together with a plat, as shown in your committee room. No report was made on Wild Cat Shoals, as testified to by Colonel Reybold, for the reason that the Army engineers thought a permit or license had been granted on this site to a corporation. However, in his testimony Colonel Reybold gave a statement concerning its possibility and declared it to be a wonderful project for power and flood control.

House Document No. 102, of 1932, by the Army engineers, goes into elaborate details as to Wild Cat Shoals, Norfolk, and Lone Rock. These three projects are located in a circle of approximately 12 miles, could and should be used as one unit. In my opinion they are the best sites for power and flood control in the United States, between the Allegheny and Rocky Mountains, and should be utilized only for the dual purpose, and will control flood waters and produce more power than any comparable sites.

The approximate cost, as estimated by the Army engineers, as detailed by Colonel Reybold, for these three main projects are as follows:

Wild Cat Shoals, 216-foot dam

Acre-feet for power.....	300,000
Acre-feet for flood.....	2,155,000
Total acre-feet.....	2,455,000

Wild Cat Shoals, 216-foot dam—Continued

Cost of construction:	
For power.....	\$8,000,000
For flood control.....	18,161,000
Total.....	26,170,000
Plus:	
Damages for power.....	411,000
Damages for flood control.....	2,954,000
Total damages.....	3,365,000
Total cost for power.....	8,420,000
Total cost for flood control.....	21,115,000
Grand total.....	29,535,000

Norfolk, 200-foot dam

Acre-feet.....	750,000
Cost of construction:	
For power.....	\$6,693,000
For flood control.....	11,978,000
Total.....	18,671,000
Plus:	
Damages for power.....	913,000
Damages for flood control.....	1,202,000
Total.....	2,115,000
Total cost for power.....	7,606,000
Total cost for flood control.....	13,180,000
Grand total.....	20,786,000

Lone Rock, 230-foot dam

Acre-feet.....	600,000
Cost of construction:	
For power.....	\$6,854,000
For flood control.....	8,128,000
Total.....	14,982,000
Plus:	
Damages for power.....	695,000
Damages for flood control.....	673,000
Total.....	1,368,000
Total cost for power.....	7,549,000
Total cost for flood control.....	8,791,000
Grand total.....	16,350,000

Over 15 years ago, when the Federal Power Commission was first created, the White River Power Co. obtained license No. 1 for a power project located at Wild Cat Shoals on White River in Arkansas. This company now has an application pending before said Commission—No. 654—for a new license. The outstanding capital stock of the White River Power Co. is owned by the Garland Power & Development Co., the common stock of which is in turn owned by the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and it is generally understood that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is owned and controlled by the Electric Bond & Share Co. of New York. And the latter company operates a majority of the electric plants in Arkansas and an equivalent number in Mississippi and Louisiana.

It is generally known that the Couch interests in Arkansas do not intend to build a plant at Wild Cat Shoals; do not now have and will not be granted a license for such purpose.

The electric power in the State of Arkansas is controlled by two large utility companies and approximately one-half the power is developed outside of the State. In addition thereto there is scarcely a State in the Union that pays a higher rate for electric power and lights. The State of Arkansas ranks among the first in rural electrification, and unless a cheaper power is obtained I fear for the welfare of these farmer organizations. North Arkansas is not only in need of cheaper power for the farmers and city dwellers in a position to buy, but for the purpose of developing its great mineral resources, which include an abundance of lead, zinc, manganese, marble, iron, phosphate, glass sand, etc.

No project where flood control dominates or where the reservoir is to be for a dual purpose can be built where the local people are required to pay the damages. As a matter of fact, there is no reason why local people should pay damages. The flood-control value is for the lower White and Mississippi Rivers and the power for the States of Arkansas and Missouri.

From the above figures it will be noticed there are 1,350,000 acre-feet in the Norfolk and Lone Rock Reservoirs, damages for flood predominate, as is true in the cost of construction. These two reservoirs present wonderful potentialities for power as well as flood control. It will be noticed that the Wild Cat Shoals project, with almost twice as many acre-feet, costs approximately seven and a half million dollars less than the other two, creates more flood pro-

tection, and develops twice the electric power. The cost for flood control on this reservoir is almost 70 percent of the entire cost.

While all three of these reservoirs must be considered in a flood-control program on the White River, I can conceive of no reason why they should be erected solely for that purpose, and would bitterly oppose any undertaking to build the reservoirs for flood control only.

No license should be given to any private concern to erect a power or flood dam on White River near Wild Cat Shoals. While I should be pleased to have included in your bill Norfolk and Lone Rock, yet I call your attention to the fact that Wild Cat Shoals is eligible and is the best project, in my opinion, that could be submitted to this committee. It only costs 9.80 per acre-foot for flood control and for such is the least cost submitted to your committee. It covers the largest drainage area and will not interfere with any Federal highways, towns, or railroads. There is ample demand and will continue to be for the sale of power.

This site is approximately 90 miles from Little Rock; 100 miles from Fort Smith; 125 miles from Memphis; 80 miles from Fayetteville; 75 miles from Springfield, Mo.; and 200 miles from St. Louis and Kansas City.

According to the estimate of the Army engineers, it will yield an average annual output of 522,776,000 kilowatt-hours, with an estimated net average return on the investment of 9.8 percent, figured on a basis of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, for secondary, and 8 mills per kilowatt-hour for 90 percent time power.

This is one project which will be self-liquidating in 15 years—20 years at the limit—and in time all three of the dams should be erected and placed in one unit.

It will furnish more electric power than is now used by the entire State of Arkansas and in conjunction with Norfolk, Lone Rock, and Beaver would furnish more than twice the power now consumed in Arkansas.

These reservoirs, with the other four projects recommended by the engineers in north Arkansas and one in Missouri, will reduce the height of a flood on the lower White River between 8 and 9 feet; and likewise reduce the flood height on the Mississippi 2½ feet. There is no other combination, such as presented in my bill, for an ideal T. V. A. project in the Nation, especially when the cost is considered. In addition thereto the main cost of these reservoirs is flood control and by their erection will serve a dual purpose.

Some provision should be included in the bill to take care of a reasonable tax upon the inundated lands and installation of necessary machinery and equipment for development of power.

I am assured the entire delegation in Congress from Arkansas joins in my contention for the inclusion of Wild Cat Shoals.

In this the Arkansas State flood-control committee joins.

There are some who would like to make a flood-control project only out of Norfolk and Lone Rock, thus taking lands out of cultivation and off the tax books and leaving dirty banks in the summer and fall when water is scarce and bringing no returns of local benefit. But I am sure this will never occur as long as I am in Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of H. R. 4721, and to include therein a statement by Martin A. McCormick, president of the Cleveland chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild, on the same bill, which has to do with the reform of Federal procedure in our courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] had time allotted to him to speak today. He will be unable to be present today and will not need the time allotted. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. BOYLAN of New York. Wednesday, April 13, was the one hundred and ninety-fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was the foremost apostle of liberty—human liberty—the world has ever known. Other men, including many who were associated with him in creating this great Republic, were more interested in the forms of freedom, in liberty as an abstract idea, than in universal emancipation. Some sought to trammel liberty and keep it within narrow bounds. Many of the founders proposed a system of government which would have been little short of a republican monarchy.

But Jefferson had an infinite faith in the people. In days of distrust of the populace, agitation, and revolution, and

at a time when democracy was but a name, he stood firm for a government in which the power would be resident not in the men of intellect, of financial influence, or social standing, but in the artificers of the cities, the woodsmen of the frontier, the laborers of the farms and plantations, the seamen along the Atlantic coast. He was the plain people's only champion at a time when they were inarticulate.

Jefferson's birthday should be a day upon which we rededicate ourselves to the many great causes and the single great principle—human liberty—for which he fought over a period of 40 years. It may seem trite to recall his services to liberty, his struggling for the doctrine of universal emancipation, but it was not so in his day. His enemies, at home and abroad, sneered at his demands for the fullest form of freedom. They pointed to the excesses of the French Revolution and shuddered at the resulting wars which drenched Europe with blood from the north to the Red Sea.

"This," they retorted, "is what liberty would give us in America."

But Jefferson never faltered; his vision was keener than theirs, his trust greater, his understanding deeper. Jefferson labored to such avail that he created not only a nation but a party.

It was only a few years afterward that Jefferson became President of a nation and a party which, largely through his own efforts, were builded on the doctrine that all men are equal in the eyes of Nature and the law; that life, liberty, and happiness are inalienable rights; that the function of government is to safeguard and guarantee those rights; and that all authority and inspiration of government are drawn from the consent of the governed.

At the present time, when violent attacks are being made against democracy, not only here but throughout the world, and when the democratic idea is challenged in many countries, it is good to consider, even for a brief moment, the inspiring life and works of the first Democrat of our country, Thomas Jefferson.

It is admitted by the leading students of American history that Thomas Jefferson is one of the great Presidents of our country. He was more than a great President, he was a great man, whose influence is an active force in our own day, and will be for generations to come.

Let us ask ourselves why this is so—why Jefferson's name is one to conjure with. Let us analyze his character and review his accomplishments. Let us see what he has done in his own day that is of such vital importance in ours.

First, Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Except for a few minor verbal changes suggested by Adams and Franklin, this epoch-making document was entirely the result of his own brain and hand and reflected his own personal views. We need not dwell upon the importance of the Declaration to our country. But consider how much light it throws upon Jefferson's mind and character.

"ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL"

These words were first used in a great political document by Jefferson. It was not a new idea of philosophy, but it was a new idea in practical politics; and had not Jefferson written the Declaration, these ringing words, it is quite likely, would have been missing therefrom.

What is more, Jefferson meant these words as written—not simply as a fine sentiment to be expressed on an important occasion.

Jefferson was a firm believer in the common people. He trusted them and considered their instincts wholesome and right. On this principle he fought Hamilton, who distrusted the people, doggedly, never yielding an inch. Jefferson could never yield on this principle for it was the foundation of his political faith. He was sure of his ground. He knew that democracy was safe in the hands of the Americans, because he knew his countrymen.

Consider what this country would be today if Jefferson and those who thought like him had not existed in the revolutionary period and Hamilton and his supporters had had their way.

We who enjoy religious freedom might fall into the erroneous belief that such freedom came to us as a matter of course. Religious freedom like political freedom had to be fought for and fostered. No great advance in civilization or human freedom has ever been accomplished without strife—oftentimes bitter strife. It is well to remember that Jefferson is the author of the Virginia statute separating church and state and guaranteeing religious freedom. In due time this important idea was made part of our Constitution. No one can possibly estimate the amount of good this provision has done and how much it has contributed to our happiness.

Jefferson went further. He fought for the establishment of free public schools and in due time became the father of the University of Virginia. He knew very well that ignorance and political and religious freedom do not well go together. He knew that the common people required education in order to preserve the liberties that they had won. No one knew better than he that education is the best weapon against tyranny and bigotry, and that an enlightened people cannot be enslaved.

It will always be remembered that nothing gave him so much happiness as the founding of the University of Virginia. He himself was a learned man in the best sense. He had an unquenchable curiosity about all things that concerned human beings. Knowledge to him was something to be treasured both for its own sake and for the use that human beings could make of it. For he was a great humanitarian.

Jefferson's opposition to slavery was well known. He was responsible for the Virginia law prohibiting the importation of slaves. In the original draft of the Declaration of Independence one of the important charges he made against George III and his Parliament was that they were responsible for slavery in America—the inhuman traffic in human beings. This was omitted in the final draft out of deference to Adams and Franklin. There was not much he could do about slavery in his own day. What he could he did.

Jefferson did much to widen the borders of our country. The Louisiana Purchase, for which he was responsible, increased the national territory about 140 percent and 13 States, in whole or in part, were carved out of it.

It will be remembered that he was the moving spirit behind the Lewis and Clark Expedition, which opened the West to the United States and made it possible for our country to grow as it did.

Jefferson never coveted or courted public office. His personal modesty followed him through life. In a sense he had no ambition whatever except the ambition to spread his democratic principles and do as much good as possible for his country and his countrymen.

He served as Ambassador to France and later as Secretary of State in a critical period of our country. He accomplished wonders in international relations. The dispatches he sent home are among the great state papers in our possession. His influence as a diplomat is lasting. He won respect for the young Republic abroad.

We can get some estimate of Jefferson as a diplomat from the following words taken from a communication of his to the American commissioners at Madrid. Jefferson wrote:

We love and we value peace; we know its blessings from experience; we abhor the follies of war and are not untried in its distresses and calamities. Unmeddling with the affairs of other nations, we have hoped that our distance and our disposition would have left us free in the example and indulgence of peace with all the world. * * * We confide in our strength without boasting of it; we respect that of others without fearing it.

The sentiment behind these words is so modern that had they been written yesterday we would not be astonished.

Jefferson served his country as President for 8 years, years marked by many important achievements. He did not want the Presidency, but his personal desires did not deter him from accepting the office when he realized that he was needed, nor from serving his country well. As President he showed the country that its affairs could be administered properly without catering to wealth and the special interests.

He demonstrated to the world that a democracy could function successfully and that freedom of speech and the press does not endanger the existence of a government. He followed Washington in not accepting a third term, thus helping to establish an important American custom.

Jefferson would not permit the country, while he was President, to embroil itself in any war. Above all, he taught the American people to trust in common sense and in reason.

In all his dealings with his fellow men he was frank and unassuming. He was a loyal friend and a magnanimous opponent. His lifelong fight was against false principles, never against persons. He was a great theorist, but a theorist who kept his feet on the ground. He was the most practical of idealists.

Volumes could be written on Jefferson the scholar, the civil engineer, the lawyer, the agriculturist, the architect, the inventor, the author, the philosopher, the statesman, the diplomat, the President, the nation-builder.

But if Jefferson himself could choose the subject of one biography of himself it is certain that the title of the book would be "Jefferson the Democrat," the word "democrat," of course, used in its widest connection.

Jefferson's general attainments were high. His knowledge of men was noteworthy and he was peculiarly fortunate in having such disciples as Madison and Monroe. Jefferson preferred never to speak of his achievements, and when he was obliged to mention his own work he did so with the utmost modesty.

He was indeed a great man who took everything, good and evil alike, in his stride.

A roll call of Jefferson's accomplishments and the broad principles he fought for sounds very much like the life work of a dozen statesmen.

"Jeffersonian democracy" is not a mere political catchword. It is a glowing ideal that should animate us, regardless of party today, even in the face of triumphs by those who have abandoned his principles, who still manifest distrust in the people's right and ability to govern their own affairs. As against the theory that people were created for the Government, which is at the root of many of our evils today, he proclaimed the principle that the Government was established for the people. Liberty to him was not a privilege—it was a right—and government a mere responsibility delegated by the people. The first and only consideration was how much government was necessary to achieve human happiness and freedom—freedom in government, freedom in education, freedom in worship.

It is time to reexamine our Government in the light of these flashes of inspiration enjoyed by our great leader. It is time for us to make a pilgrimage, if only in fancy, to the grave of Thomas Jefferson and draw renewed faith in the people from the following epitaph which he wrote himself:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

On a beautiful site adjoining the Tidal Basin, in the city of Washington, D. C., the Jefferson Memorial Commission proposes to erect a fitting memorial to properly honor the great Jefferson.

This site has been approved by the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The plans are by the famous architect, John Russell Pope. Application has been made to Congress for funds to commence this work.

It will then be possible for a visitor to Washington to view the magnificent Jefferson Memorial, then proceed southward over a hard macadam road to Jefferson's home at Monticello, Va. His home was purchased in 1922 by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation in New York, of which the Honorable Stewart G. Gibbons is chairman.

The buildings have been restored to their original lines by the Foundation under the direction of Dr. Fisk-Kimball, of Philadelphia.

A day thus spent will revive patriotic memories in the hearts of all who visit it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Mr. R. E. Sherman, former mayor of El Paso, Tex., at the Jefferson Day dinner in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address by George E. Sokolsky on the subject of How Long Will We Have Religious Liberty?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made by me last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Howard Costigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to me by Secretary Woodring.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials from the Country Gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to get any time this afternoon during the consideration of the bill now pending.

However, I have painstakingly gathered many opinions relative to the spending process suggested, and I wish to revise my own remarks relating to what one writer has called "The dance of the billions—sweet music to the spenders, but a dirge to the taxpayers." I trust the following remarks under privilege to revise are timely.

Interesting, indeed, to read the comments and learn the views of the people regarding the decision of the administration to resume the discredited pump-priming process on the huge scale presented to Congress. Further borrowing of the funds and savings of the people again to be lavished upon nonprofitable, nonliquidating, extravagant, and wasteful projects, the inactive gold purchased with borrowed funds at interest, and regarded as hot money because it is subject to withdrawal by foreign countries, is now to be converted into greenbacks to run the Government, assuring our people that

this process will not greatly increase our indebtedness—that is, to increase spending of four billions, it is only necessary to borrow one billion. Those beyond the primer class in finance will fail to see much difference if we spend our assets and recoverables. It is suggested that the process is similar to spending the savings in the baby's bank. This spending process is terrifying to thoughtful people. This is but a repetition of the process which brought us straight into this great Roosevelt depression. Can this be the only answer of the miracle men in Washington?

After months of inaction and wishful waiting for business up-turn, what a barrage of spending Government money is to be fired in one volley! A message to the Congress of staggering amounts demanded. A fireside chat follows with the admonition that "there is placed on all of us the duty of self-restraint by articulate public opinion." Opposition to this program is most articulate, and it is generally condemned by public opinion. He asks for a common effort and a common faith in each other. Who is it that has constantly, during the past 5 years, expressed lack of faith in those who manage affairs of business and finance? He would not let the people down. The question is sharply asked, "Will he let the people up?" Under the vast powers granted him over business and finance, certainly it is he that has been holding them down. More gifts and loans to States and municipalities. Their own borrowing capacity has been largely used up and cannot even furnish the 10 percent generally required. As in the past, will many not resist repayment? Although States might share proportionally in the largesses, certain States, through the years of repayment, would pay many times their share. Indeed, these latter States are far outnumbered by those which would repay but little. Since the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution the backward States have learned that it is only votes that are needed, and, because they are in the majority, vote themselves vast improvements at the expense of the more thrifty. I repeat, how comforting to the Nation to be told that we need not go further into debt, but will dissipate our assets. Will this serve to allay the great fear in the hearts of our people? Can it be possible that our President has again yielded to those whose advice has brought us to our present predicament? True, brave words of Eleanor Patterson, "It is fear, Mr. President, and it is fear of you." The swift recessions in business after every temporary up-turn during the past 5 years have furnished ample proof of her assertion. Emanations of encouragement or displeasure from the White House have immediately been followed by favorable or unfavorable results. Declaration from that source that copper and other basic materials were too high immediately caused prices to fall on the market. Self-restraint in articulate damnations of our Nation's leaders in finance and business has not been practiced by the President. Ugly phrases—a long list—coined by him are now historic and of record, and well may we doubt any real change of heart in spite of recent fireside conciliatory declarations.

Many of us may recall a former schoolmaster who might apologize after administering harsh punishment, but we knew full well that he would do the same again when he was sufficiently irritated. The proposal to administer this same medicine as in 1933, 1934, and 1935, after full knowledge of its utter failure to bring any permanent recovery, should be disheartening, disappointing and, I repeat, terrifying to even his faithful followers. To spend our gold and recoverables as fast as they are realized upon in view of the more than \$7,000,000,000 of foreign deposits and investments in this country causes us to recall the President's own worry, expressed about a year ago, concerning the grave danger of hot money and sudden withdrawals. The question is pointedly asked, "Does the issuance of gold certificates by the Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks in return for money or credit really mean that if and when actual gold is released the Federal Reserve banks and member banks will be entitled to it?" From our past experience with this administration, we may well believe that the Treasury can issue any so-called

lawful printed money and demand that the banks should accept such money for these highly prized gold certificates. Let us be reminded that the Federal Reserve System already holds these gold certificates to the amount of some \$8,000,000,000 against our supply of a total of twelve billion in gold. Those who have a realization of what inflation means have reason to doubt the 40-percent value back of the notes issued, if canceled by forced acceptance of any printed money.

However, this Government of ours has maneuvered itself into such a hodge-podge of money manipulation that no economist seems able to advise the duly accredited committees of the Congress with any assurance of the effects to be anticipated. The Federal Reserve Board must subordinate its own opinions, acts, and decisions to harmonize with the needs of the Treasury in its huge borrowings and loan renewals, with about one-half the Treasury borrowings on a short-time basis. Business investment must not, and cannot, be allowed to become as attractive as a United States bond or certificate of indebtedness. All informed persons fully understand that as soon as business and investment offer more attractive rates of interest, United States securities will be placed upon the market in dangerous quantities. Can financiers be blamed for the lurking suspicion that many measures have been deliberately planned and thought necessary to accomplish the present condition? However, the maze of doubt and uncertainty and lack of understanding of these problems have left us in a hazy, helpless state of inaction, and we are forced to drift toward the rocks we all know are not too far ahead. We seem not to have the courage to retrace our course to the safer harbor.

Constant reiteration of the President's words to us on March 10, 1933, may startle us from our insensibility and remind him of his emphatic description of the only safe road to follow. I quote:

"For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy." He then recounted the Hoover deficits, totaling the combined red figures of 1931, 1932, and the fiscal year estimated until June 30, 1933, and said:

"Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000."

In his first and second administrations, Mr. Roosevelt now has piled up nearly \$17,000,000,000 of deficits. His words on March 10, 1933, were:

"With the utmost seriousness, I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact (the \$5,000,000,000 deficits) on our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order."

"Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of agricultural products, and the availability of employment."

"The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it."

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

In the words of David Lawrence—

Patriotic citizens will agree with the resolute and heroic Roosevelt of 1933 and not with the political-minded Roosevelt of 1938, who has just ordered more pump priming even after the first experiment proved a ghastly failure.

And also by the same writer:

To know that at any moment, if you do not toe the mark, Mr. Roosevelt will send word to your State or district and encourage some local candidate to enter the race against you, letting you know that the White House and the Federal officeholders will be behind that candidate, is enough to line up certain wavering votes in Congress.

Have we arrived to a condition of bankrupt statesmanship? Is the present philosophy of government a philosophy of despair? We have tried managed money; we have not been able to manage the money users! Large sums for pump priming have found their way to the hoarders and Government bond purchasers and generate no business.

There appears but little printed support of this pump-priming process. It would seem to be almost a unanimous protest against it. A reasonable amount for relief, if wisely spent, is not challenged; but against expenditures for certain types of made work, where not over 25 cents of the dollar actually is received by the reliefer, strong protests should certainly be made. The Congress should specify in no uncertain terms the conditions under which relief money is to be spent.

Personal letters written to me contain such comments as follows:

Oppose his spending ideas and other crazy schemes that pop out of his mind at unexpected moments—schemes that are rapidly plunging this country into bankruptcy.

Cut expenses rather than taxing us all to financial death.

Congress is our only hope.

Do get busy and do something.

Pump priming of no avail unless shackles are taken off and persecution of business ceases.

Business would be aided by elimination of Government competition, curing of labor difficulties, cooperation instead of persecution by Government.

Confusion, inefficiency, waste, ineffectiveness are charged in this political orgy of spending. The country is against it. Are politicians—as we are called—the only ones besides the direct beneficiaries in favor of it?

To return to the safe road would not be difficult. It lacks only the determination and courage of those in power to acknowledge failure of present policies and return to the more simple fundamentals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two statements of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF JOSEPHINE FONTANA

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30, which has to do with the bill (H. R. 5793) for the relief of Josephine Fontana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution 30

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 5793) for the relief of Josephine Fontana be, and it is hereby, rescinded, and the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the bill with the following amendments, viz: On page 1, lines 6, 7, and 8 of the engrossed bill, strike out "Josephine Fontana, of West Springfield, Mass., the sum of \$600 in full satisfaction of her claim" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Nathaniel M. Harvey, as administrator of the estate of Josephine Fontana, late of West Springfield, Mass., the sum of \$600, in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Josephine Fontana"; and amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Nathaniel M. Harvey, as administrator of the estate of Josephine Fontana, deceased."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BETTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] recently introduced a bill creating a national system of unemployment insurance for employees engaged on our transportation systems. This is a very necessary and essential piece of legislation, and should be agreed to without delay in order to prevent State systems from coming into being. These State systems would prove costly and burdensome; they would be difficult to administer; and in the interest of clarity and orderly procedure, as well as economy and efficiency of operation, a national system should supplant them. I trust the bill will receive prompt consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that it will pass the Congress at this session.

I. GENERAL CONTENT

The bill creates a national pooled-fund system of unemployment insurance for railroad workers. To that end Congress asserts its constitutional jurisdiction over this type of interstate employment, and, as of July 1, 1939, requires the States to cease covering this employment under their unemployment compensation laws and excludes it from coverage under title IX of the Social Security Act. In line with the growing recognition of the necessity for simplification of the social-security program, it is provided that both old-age and unemployment insurance for railroad workers will be wholly administered by a single Federal agency, on the basis of a single set of reports, from exactly the same employers, paying what is in effect a single tax, because the contributions under this bill are levied on exactly the same base as the taxes levied by the Carriers' Taxing Act.

II. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROVISIONS

First. Coverage: Identical with that of Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, namely, interstate railroads, certain of their operating subsidiaries, sleeping-car and express companies, traffic and similar associations maintained by the railroads, and railroad labor organizations.

Second. Contributions: After July 1, 1939, covered employers will pay 3 percent of wages payable, excluding any amount in excess of \$300 per month payable to any employee. The rate is the same as the combined rate under a typical State unemployment compensation law and title IX. The wage exclusion is the same as that in the Carriers' Taxing Act.

Third. Railroad unemployment insurance account: Ninety percent of the contributions will be deposited in the railroad unemployment insurance account, to be maintained, like the State unemployment compensation accounts, by the Secretary of the Treasury in the unemployment trust fund established by section 904 of the Social Security Act.

Provision is also made for the transfer to the railroad unemployment insurance account from State unemployment compensation accounts of the balance of the amounts paid to them by the employers covered by this bill.

The railroad unemployment insurance account can be used solely for the payment of benefits.

Fourth. Railroad unemployment insurance administration fund: Ten percent of the contributions, together with any additional appropriations which Congress may make will be maintained in the Treasury as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund, to be used solely for the payment of administrative costs.

If this fund has excessive balances after 1946, such part thereof as the Railroad Retirement Board deems proper may be transferred to the railroad unemployment insurance account.

Fifth. Qualifications for benefits: An employee of a covered employer will be qualified to receive benefits—

(a) Prior employment: If within the appropriate preceding calendar year he had earned \$150 or more from covered employment.

(b) Waiting period: If within 6 months preceding the beginning of any benefit year he had had 15 consecutive days of unemployment or 2 half months in each of which there were 8 days of unemployment, for which benefits were not paid.

Sixth. Disqualifications: An employee will be disqualified for benefits for defined periods of 15, 30, 45, and 75 days for such reasons as unavailability for suitable work, refusal to accept suitable work, voluntarily quitting without good cause, discharge for misconduct, and the making of fraudulent claims for benefits.

An employee will also be disqualified for benefits, while on a strike in violation of the Railway Labor Act or of the rules of his labor organization; while in receipt of an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act, or old-age insurance under title II of the Social Security Act, or unemployment benefits under any State unemployment-compensation law; and during any month—or half month—during which he performs 50 percent—25 percent—of the maximum employment allowable to him under a contract of employment providing for the determination of his compensation, wholly or partially, on a mileage basis.

Seventh. Benefits: Benefits will be paid for each day of total unemployment in excess of seven during any period of 15 days, in an amount ranging from \$1.75 to \$3, according to the employee's total earnings from covered employment in a preceding calendar year. The maximum total amount of benefits payable to any employee during a period of 12 months will be 80 times his so-called daily benefit amount.

Benefits are paid on a daily basis for administrative convenience. They are paid for days of unemployment in excess of seven in order not to pay benefits to a worker who has earned about 50 percent of his normal semimonthly wage.

Translated into more customary terms, the rates range from \$14 to \$24 per half month of total employment; the maximum duration is a flat 5 months.

The benefit schedule is reproduced below:

Total compensation in base year	Daily benefit amount	Maximum amount of benefits payable in any benefit year
\$150 to \$199.99	\$1.75	140
\$200 to \$249.99	2.00	160
\$250 to \$299.99	2.25	180
\$300 to \$349.99	2.50	200
\$350 to \$399.99	2.75	220
\$400 and over	3.00	240

Eighth. Administration—(a) General: The plan is to be administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, which is given the necessary powers, among which is that of appointing, subject to civil-service rules and regulations, a director of unemployment insurance at a salary of \$10,000 per year.

The Board is authorized to establish special employment offices for railroad workers and to enter into arrangements with employers, labor organizations, State unemployment compensation and employment service agencies, and others to assist in its work, particularly that of registering the unemployed for work and receiving claims for benefits, and to pay for such services.

(b) Claims for benefits: Fully authorized employees of the Board make the first determination on any claim for benefits. From this determination a worker may appeal to a district board, consisting of one representative each of the Board, of employees and of employers. The Board may review the decisions of the district boards, or permit a worker to appeal such a decision to the Board itself.

After all administrative remedies within the Board have been exhausted, any claim may be appealed to the Federal courts.

(c) Reciprocal arrangements with other unemployment-compensation agencies: With respect to workers who have been employed both by railroad and nonrailroad employers, the Board is authorized to enter into arrangements by which (a) if a State agency pays benefits to such workers, in part on the basis of their railroad employment, the Board will equitably reimburse the State agency or (b) if the Board pays benefits to such workers, in part on the basis of their

nonrailroad employment, the State agency will equitably reimburse the Board.

(d) Advisory councils: The Board may appoint, without compensation, national or local advisory councils of representatives of employers, employees, and the public to discuss problems in connection with the administration of the plan and to help in the formulation of policies.

Ninth. Social Security Act and Social Security Board—(a) Title III: Section 303 is amended by providing that the Social Security Board shall make no certification for payment of an administrative grant to any State unemployment compensation agency if it finds that the agency (1) does not make its records available to the Railroad Retirement Board, or (2) does not afford reasonable cooperation to every Federal agency administering an unemployment-insurance law.

(b) Title IX: Sections 904 (a) and 904 (e) are amended to provide for the railroad unemployment-insurance account in the unemployment trust fund. Section 907 (c) is amended to exempt employment covered by this bill from the title IX tax.

(c) Transfer from State funds: The Social Security Board is directed to determine, by agreement with the Railroad Retirement Board and after consultation with each State, a rough approximation of the balance of the amounts collected by each State unemployment-compensation fund prior to November 1, 1939, from employers covered by this bill. Unless a State shall direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer this balance to the railroad unemployment-insurance account, the Social Security Board shall deduct this amount from its administrative grants to the State, until the total balance has been so deducted, and certify such amount for deposit in the railroad unemployment-insurance account. Notwithstanding the present restrictions in sections 303 (a) (5) and 903 (a) (4) of the Social Security Act, the State may then withdraw from the unemployment trust fund the amounts which the Social Security Board finds to be necessary for proper administration of its unemployment-compensation law.

Tenth. District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act: The District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act is amended, effective July 1, 1939, to exclude employment as defined in this bill from coverage both for contribution and benefit purposes and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make the transfer of the amount required to be transferred to the railroad unemployment insurance account.

Eleventh. Transitional provisions: These provide that if a worker has started a benefit year under a State law between July 1, 1938, and June 30, 1939, he shall be eligible during the balance of such year to receive benefits under this bill.

(a) If qualified as of July 1, 1939: At the rate to which he is entitled under this bill, until he has drawn, including the amounts already received under the State law, the maximum payable to him under this bill.

(b) If not qualified as of July 1, 1939, but solely because of the passage of this bill, is ineligible to continue to receive benefits under the State law: At the minimum rate herein provided until he has drawn the balance of the benefits which he would otherwise have been entitled to under the State law.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we had an understanding the other day we would continue general debate until 2 o'clock today.

Mr. POWERS. That is correct.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. We did not assume this much time was going to be taken up by other matters, so I suggest, in view of that fact, that general debate run until

2:40, which will give within 10 minutes of 2 hours for general debate. This is in keeping with the spirit of the agreement made the other day.

Mr. POWERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have requests on this side for approximately an hour and thirty-five minutes of time.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Then I will make it the full 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. POWERS. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we agreed the other day that we would close general debate at 2 o'clock, and no time for general debate was agreed upon. We debated this bill for 4 hours.

Mr. TABER. We did not understand an hour was going to be consumed on other matters.

Mr. RAYBURN. We want to pass this bill and another one this afternoon, if possible.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, as far as the bill itself is concerned, its consideration will not take very long.

Mr. RAYBURN. Very often we hear that, and the opposite is true.

Mr. SNELL. I know that.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I do not believe there is any controversy over the time.

Mr. SNELL. When the original agreement was made it was not expected we would run until 1 o'clock on something else.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and himself?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10291, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I reported to the House on yesterday the second installment of the War Department budget. It will be recalled that nonmilitary appropriations were divorced from appropriations for the Military Establishment last year; so this is the second separate measure for handling those appropriations of the War Department which do not properly constitute a charge to national defense. I desire to speak briefly about some of its provisions.

As to its Engineer Corps phases, this measure reaches practically into every nook and corner of the country; and I might say we hear from most of them in one way or another during our subcommittee labors.

Aside from rivers and harbors and flood-control works, the bill carries appropriations for the establishment, support, and maintenance of burial places of our soldier dead; for the Army's radio communication system in and with the Territory of Alaska; for all expenses attaching to the office of our High Commissioner in the Philippine Islands; for running the Soldiers' Home here in Washington; and for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

As to such propositions, there is little in the bill about which I feel there is warrant for special or extended comment. Collectively, the bill makes available for them \$12,812,925, which includes a reappropriation of \$25,000. That amount is \$106,838 less than the sum of current appropriations and \$381,162 less than Budget recommendations.

As to cemetery expenses, we have deducted \$329,692 on account of a proposed new cemetery in the vicinity of San Francisco. The authorization act countenances an expenditure of \$200,000 for the purchase of land for that additional cemetery and the Budget looks to the payment of as much as that amount for land, but we found that it was planned to buy but something like 165 acres and to pay therefor something like \$1,200 per acre. That struck us as a bit too high. It is our thought that a further canvass should be made, possibly going somewhat farther away from the city limits.

For the Alaska communication system, aside from an increase occasioned by the transfer of the expense of travel to this bill from the military bill, there is but one other addition of consequence, namely, \$7,250 for providing additional facilities to cope with the increasing load and to handle traffic more expeditiously. The system turned into the Treasury last year \$366,780.

For running the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines we met with an increase of \$28,200, which is broken down for you on page 4 of the report. You will see there that the principal item is rent. This year \$18,600 is available for rent. For next year we are asked to provide \$33,000, and we also are asked to make an additional \$2,100 available for the present fiscal year.

The \$33,000 divides—\$18,000 for offices and \$15,000 for quarters—as opposed to the set-up this year of \$12,000 for offices and \$6,600 for quarters, to which latter amount \$2,100 will need to be added.

These rent items it should be understood will disappear as soon as our own building for offices and quarters in Manila, for which an appropriation has been made, has been erected. Construction is still in the blue print stage, but should be commenced in the very near future.

As to office space, the High Commissioner stated to us that expansion is imperative in the interest of efficiency and for the health of his staff. That is a tropical climate and the offices are not air-conditioned and he has as many as seven employees in a single small room. For increasing the present space about a third of its present size will require an additional \$6,000.

As to quarters, it seems that the owner of the residence now occupied has returned to Manila after an extended absence and wants his property back. He has been renting it to the High Commissioner at the rate of \$6,600 per annum, which just about pays the taxes. We are advised that the only other immediately available property at all suitable rents at the rate of \$15,000 per annum, and that property, I understand, has been rented, subject to an appropriation being made, effective the 1st of this month.

I call your attention to another matter touching this office. Commissioner McNutt appeared before the Subcommittee in person and was very much disturbed because the Budget had turned a deaf ear to his recommendations touching personnel, both in the way of extra help and advances in pay. His rejected recommendations called for a total of \$18,760. The committee went over each proposition with him and concluded later to approve of the items shown on page 5 of the report, amounting to \$5,530. In that itemization you will see two American caretakers. At the present time two guards are appropriated for at \$900 each. The incumbents are Filipinos. Mr. McNutt asked us to allow the two caretakers, and four guards at \$1,200 each, all to be Americans. I think you will agree that he makes a very good case for all of them in his statement on page 46 of the hearings, but the subcommittee concluded to recommend as you see there on page 5 of the report.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Referring to this increase of rent for Mr. McNutt from \$6,000 to \$15,000, it seems to me that is an awful high price to pay for rent for the space required in the Philippines.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I may state to my friend from Pennsylvania that the committee thought the same way, but inasmuch as the man who owned this place unexpectedly came back and demanded it because he wanted to live in his own home, they had to get quarters elsewhere, and these were the only available quarters that were at all suitable. So the committee, after hearing much that is not on the record, I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania, decided that this was the only thing we could do.

Mr. RICH. I was just thinking, perhaps, because Mr. McNutt came over here and spent \$3,000 for one party, maybe he is getting high-hat and thought he required a new and greater palace to live in on going back to the Philippines.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. McNutt is leaving the Philippines for good the 1st of October and he stated it did not make any personal difference to him whether we allowed this or not, because he would not enjoy it, inasmuch as he would not be over there. I might also make this statement. You can readily see, with all the turmoil in the countries right around the Philippine Islands, that more guards and caretakers are required than would be the case under normal social conditions in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that the Soldiers' Home appropriation is slightly reduced. As a matter of fact, there are a number of minor increases which are offset by expected lighter demands for hospitalizing members elsewhere than at the home. The principal increase, an item of \$13,500, is for rehabilitating and extending the chicken-farm plant.

For the Panama Canal and Canal Zone the appropriation proposed is \$323,635 less than the current year total, and \$57,000 under the Budget estimate. The Budget reduction is contributed to for the most part by a lessened outlay, as it nears completion, upon the new dredging division station at Gamboa. The reduced amount for that project, in conjunction with planned smaller outlays upon other improvements and betterments, compensate for the quadrennial expense, occurring in 1939, of overhauling the Atlantic locks and leave a substantial margin besides.

I shall turn now to the Engineer Corps, and first direct your attention to the summation at the bottom of page 5 of the report, pertaining to rivers and harbors.

There you will see that we are going along with the Budget as to maintenance. The increase over the current year is \$322,101, and that, obviously, is not a great deal considering the projects that have been brought to a maintenance status within the past few years.

For new work, the Budget sent in an estimate of \$32,800,000 to apply on presently authorized projects, some in a going status and others—many others—remaining to be initiated, which will cost to complete \$209,113,000. Eighteen million dollars of the Budget estimate is earmarked right off as indicated on page 9 of the report. It just is not good business nor good engineering practice to dally along with projects once undertaken, nor would it seem conformable with intent, after laws are enacted authorizing meritorious projects, to treat as inconsequential the time of their initiation, and delay their commencement indefinitely. Here we have, as I have stated, \$209,000,000 worth of projects ready to be proceeded with; there is another authorized group, some temporarily and others permanently in a shelved status, which have a total authorized cost of \$47,000,000 plus, and, I understand, another authorization bill is now in the making, and yet we meet with an estimate of \$32,800,000, largely earmarked as I have indicated.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does the amount you are recommending compare with the Budget estimate?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. We are proposing here \$94,300,000 all told for rivers and harbors. Of that amount \$56,800,000 is for new work.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does that compare with what the Budget recommended?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. The Budget recommended \$32,800,000 for new work.

Mr. Chairman, we felt that something more ought to be done than it would be possible to do under the Budget estimate. I might say we were not alone in that view, for we were besieged at every turn to make more generous provision than did the Budget.

Our solution is to make available possibly as much as \$24,000,000 more than the Budget estimate by way of a reappropriation. The bill last year, it will be recalled, specifically set aside \$52,000,000 of W. P. A. funds for flood-control uses. That amount has been separately warranted by the Treasury and cannot be used for any other purpose. We are advised that at least \$18,000,000 of the total will not be spent and that the unused part may reach \$24,000,000. Whatever the amount, not exceeding \$24,000,000, we are proposing its diversion to river and harbor uses, and, if our proposal be approved, the money will be employed as indicated in the second column of figures in the table commencing on page 6 of the report.

Now, flood control: First, may I call your attention to the table on page 10 of the report. For the present year, under the Copeland and Overton Acts, there is a total available of \$105,000,000. We are advised that it may not be possible to expend as much as \$24,000,000 of that amount. That is the W. P. A. money to which I referred a moment ago.

For 1939 the original Budget included a total of \$76,000,000, \$50,000,000 under the Copeland or General Act, and \$26,000,000 under the Overton Act relating to the Mississippi.

In his message the other day, which has been printed as House Document No. 594, the President recommended an appropriation of \$37,000,000 over and above the estimates for the immediate undertaking of presently authorized flood-control works. After consultation with the office of the Chief of Engineers, we have added \$32,000,000 of that amount to the original estimate of \$50,000,000 for general flood control, and \$5,000,000 to the original estimate of \$26,000,000 for flood-control work under the Overton Act.

Under the General Flood Control Act, the authorized projects have an authorized cost of \$344,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Let me complete the flood control first. The current appropriation is the first specifically made toward the accomplishment of that work. There remains to be appropriated, subject, of course, to the amount of W. P. A. funds which are not expended, something in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000. The appropriation proposed is in the neighborhood of 27 percent of that amount, which certainly cannot be said to be a too rapid rate of progress considering the ever present possibility of recurring devastating floods in many sections of the country with the attendant loss of life and property.

I cannot indicate to you exactly how the appropriation will be allocated. In the first place the law gives the President exclusive say as to that. If you will turn to page 150 of the hearings you will see how the Chief of Engineers would employ the original Budget estimate, which came to us including \$1,000,000 for surveys. We are proposing to make \$6,000,000 available for surveys. That excess, however, will be charged to the amount we are adding to the original estimate. I should say, therefore, that the projects will follow rather closely those embraced on the table to which I have called attention, possibly with somewhat larger allocations to some projects, and, in addition, selected projects, which qualify as to local cooperation, from the list commencing on page 154 of the hearings.

The survey money will be available one-half to the Corps of Engineers and one-half to the Department of Agriculture, conformably with the authorization act.

Now, directing your attention to the Mississippi project, I call your attention to page 12 of the report. As there stated,

the existing authorization permits of a total expenditure of \$597,000,000. Roundly \$333,000,000 of that amount has been appropriated, including \$15,000,000 the present fiscal year by way of allotment of emergency relief funds, of which it appears that not more than \$2,000,000 will be obligated. This bill provides for the reappropriation of that unused money to river and harbor uses. Therefore, actually there remains to be appropriated roundly \$277,000,000. However, that figure may be very substantially reduced in consequence of a restudy under way of the so-called Eudora floodway project. A sum in excess of \$100,000,000 would be needed to accomplish the Eudora project.

The additional amount of \$5,000,000 we are proposing, I understand, would be employed in augmentation of the amounts shown in the break-down of the original estimate on page 12 of the report. The total sum of \$31,000,000 recommended for appropriation exceeds by about \$3,000,000 the total average annual expenditure since the fiscal year 1928, and is about the equivalent of the amount that will be expended or obligated of the \$45,000,000 made available the present fiscal year.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that there is something more than \$830,000,000 worth of authorized river and harbor and flood-control projects awaiting the provision of funds for their prosecution. It seems to me that we should weigh with exceeding care any new additions to that total. I address that observation particularly to those of you who have projects which have not even been started or which are not going forward as rapidly as they undoubtedly should.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman referred to the President's message of April 14, 1938. That message contained a statement, I quote, as follows:

I recommend an appropriation of \$37,000,000 over and above estimates for the immediate undertaking of flood-control and reclamation works to be expended on projects already authorized by this or former Congresses.

The gentleman referred to only that portion of the message which concerns flood control. Do I correctly understand the gentleman that he is taking the words of the President as meaning that \$32,000,000 shall be used for flood control and nothing for reclamation?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. That certainly was not the understanding of the Members of Congress from the irrigated-land States. I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that reclamation is a distinct part of the recommendation of the President in his message? I am not criticizing the gentleman, except I disagree with his interpretation of the President's message.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. We interpreted it as being for flood-control projects.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. But it says flood control and reclamation.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. There is a certain element of reclamation in flood-control work.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. We from the irrigated-land States certainly do not wish to acquiesce in any idea that reclamation is to be left out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some of these flood control reservoir projects are combined flood control and reclamation. Would the gentleman think that it might be expected that this \$32,000,000 out of the \$37,000,000 would be used for that type of flood control, and being so used is also valuable for reclamation?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. It would be possible, under the law, for the President to make allocations to projects of that character.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. This appropriation covers the civil functions of the War Department. May I ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations why we do not make appropriations for the operation of the Inland Waterways Corporation? That is administered by the War Department and it takes in and spends a tremendous amount of money each year. It seems to me that Congress, through its Appropriations Committee, should exercise control over these expenditures, as we do all other agencies of the United States.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. The Corporation is operating out of its revenues.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. The Inland Waterways Corporation does a very large business, running into the millions each year. It seems to me as if they take in the money and then buy boats and equipment and operate its lines just as it sees fit, without any responsibility to the elected representatives of the people. The United States owns that Corporation just as it owns other federally controlled corporations who come to Congress for authority to spend public funds. We appropriate for the Panama Canal, which takes in receipts and covers the money into the Treasury of the United States. We do not do that, however, for this important agency of the Government that operates the barge lines in the Middle West.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. If they needed additional capital, they would come to our committee. I may say to the gentleman that last year, if I recall correctly, we did call the head of the Corporation before our committee, although we had no request for funds before us.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. General Ashburn, I think, is still the general manager.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. We called him before our committee and had him put in the record all of the details relating to the operation, procedure, and finances of that Corporation and, as a result, reduced his capital account.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I can very well appreciate the gentleman's position, if he will yield further, but I take the definite attitude that here is an agency that is spending the people's money. We appropriate for the Army and Navy to buy new battleships, airplanes, and everything else. Now why should we not do that for this particular agency? If it wants to buy a towboat or barges, why should not the Congress tell them in simple appropriation language that so much money shall be spent for this purpose or some other purpose?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. That would require a change in the basic law.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. May I say with all due respect that I am not condemning the gentleman's work or the work of his committee. However, I believe it is a field in which the Congress should exert itself and explore into and I hope the gentleman and his committee will do so next year.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert certain tables and statistics bearing on the speech I am about to make.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ford of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the subject on which I wish to speak today is one which not so long ago had never been heard of by this House, much less by the Nation. In fact, it did not even have a name. Today, thanks to the efforts of our great President and of the Congress, it has become a reality to millions of people. I refer to social security.

Passed in 1935, effective in 1936, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1937, the Social

Security Act is now, in 1938, in practical operation throughout the length and breadth of the land. What is more, within these brief 3 years it has come to be accepted as a matter of course throughout the country. This well-nigh universal acceptance is tremendously significant. It is an evidence of how desperately protection was needed—and is needed today—against Nation-wide hazards of want and destitution. It is a tribute to the vision and leadership of this administration. And it is a measure of the practical good sense and skill with which Congress and its advisers translated that vision into the workable, and working, terms of the present law.

Looking back, as I can, at every step of the way we have come, I am somewhat surprised to find that the first indexed reference to social security in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is dated no earlier than February 12, 1935. The fact that this recognition of social security by name occurred on the birthday of a great President, Abraham Lincoln, is a happy coincidence.

The rapidity with which the Social Security Act has been woven into the very fabric of American life is an incontrovertible test of its success. Yet it has a certain disadvantage; for what is taken for granted is seldom examined in detail, either by its critics or by its friends. And so we run the risk, on the one hand, of failing to appreciate fully all that we ourselves have actually accomplished, and, on the other, of expecting too soon a degree of perfection which can come only with time and experience.

It takes imagination, as well as statistics, to visualize the full import of this great law. It is one thing, for example, to know that over 38,000,000 workers are covered by the Federal old-age insurance program established under the act. But it is another thing to understand what this means to each of these working men and women and to their families, what it means to have now, for the first time, an opportunity of building up an old-age income through an individual's own work and industry, and with the full strength of the United States Government behind it.

It is one thing to know that every State in the Union has enacted an unemployment compensation law since the passage of the Federal act, and that 23 States are already paying benefits, nearly 9,000,000 checks having been issued since January 1 of this year. But it is another thing to understand what this means, not only to labor but also to business, now that wage earners have this backlog of insurance to help bridge the gap between jobs.

It is one thing to know that two and one-fourth million of our poor people—the old, the blind, and dependent little children—are receiving public assistance from combined Federal and State funds under the act. But it is another thing to understand what a regular cash allowance means to these people who cannot possibly support themselves. It means that those whom old age or loss of sight has robbed of a livelihood can be saved from the poorhouse. It means that children, who have been deprived of parental support by the death or incapacity of father, mother, or both, need not be separated from their families simply because the orphanage is their only refuge from hunger and want.

Finally, it is one thing to know that Federal cooperation has enabled every State in the Union to expand and strengthen its public-health, child-welfare, and vocational rehabilitation services. But it is quite another thing to understand, in terms of human lives, what such services can do and are doing to forestall dependency and disease and death.

No. You cannot tell me that the favored few, who have not seen insecurity face to face, have yet begun to understand all that the Social Security Act means. But the people know—the workers who are only now getting their first chance to save securely for old age; who can now face losing a job with at least something to count on that is theirs as a right and not a hand-out; the old folks for whom hand-to-mouth dependency has been replaced by a regular monthly check; the widowed mothers who can keep their children with them; the disabled workers who have be-

come self-supporting again through rehabilitation services; the crippled children who are receiving medical care—all these and their families can tell you and me what the new protections now available really mean.

I do not intend to imply that the Social Security Act is the only measure through which this administration has been, and is, combating insecurity. Through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the Works Progress Administration, through housing and resettlement and a host of other activities, we have been building toward social and economic security on a very broad front. Each of these programs has performed a function essential to this building process, and each has made its full contribution to the structure we have been and still are rearing.

But the Social Security Act is the keystone. It is the keystone because it is designed to meet problems which are with us in good years as in bad. It is the keystone because it represents our first continuing and constructive effort not only to provide for present needs but also to forestall future needs. And it is the keystone because it recognizes, for once and all, that the Federal Government of these United States, as well as the States themselves and their localities, must play a permanent part in any security program worthy of the name.

I have said that social security is new. It is true that in its present Nation-wide form the program has been in operation only 2 years. But neither its purposes nor its methods are new. Insecurity is as old as the human race, and the whole history of civilization might well be described as a progressive struggle to master it. Not to go too far back, in our own country the acceptance of public responsibility for the common welfare is older by at least two centuries than acceptance of such other prerogatives of democracy as public education and universal suffrage. As a matter of fact, the failure of our public-welfare provisions in the recent past was largely due to obsolescence. For while their insistence that each locality must be a law unto itself no doubt made sense when it was formulated in 1603, and even for a good part of the next two centuries, it had become sheer nonsense by 1933. Yet, regardless of how industry and invention had broken down old barriers, we tried to get along right up to that time with public-welfare practices that were hoary with age long before the United States came into existence.

A nation thus plays Rip Van Winkle at its own peril; and during the depression we paid the penalty in human lives and in colossal inroads upon public funds. With millions of people forced upon relief, with towns and counties and even States on the verge of bankruptcy, we were finally forced to admit that the common welfare is a national responsibility. The Federal Government accepted its share in that responsibility under the present administration; and in 1934, 18,000,000 men and women and children were being helped by Federal funds.

But we did not stop there. Those years of anguish had argued the case for placing Federal participation on a permanent footing. And in 1934, while Federal emergency measures were at their height, the President appointed his Committee on Economic Security to study the long-term problems of security. The profound significance of this proposal for a continuing national security program was fully understood by this Committee and by Congress. The Committee devoted more than a half a year to the development of its recommendations. Transmitted to Congress by the President, these received months of thoughtful and painstaking consideration. The public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee alone took 3 weeks, and their record fills a volume of over 1,000 pages. Following these and similar hearings before the Finance Committee of the Senate, many weeks were devoted to further examination in committee and on the floor of both Houses of Congress.

The Social Security Act, as it emerged from this prolonged period of study, offered, we then believed, a practical framework within which the Federal Government, the States and

their localities could join forces for immediate and far-reaching action. That faith has now been confirmed by facts.

I have before me tables showing current operations under the Social Security Act, which I shall not have time to present in detail.

TABLE 1.—Cumulative total of applications for social-security account numbers at close of business Mar. 31, 1938

Alabama	518,706
Arizona	133,639
Arkansas	254,178
California	2,419,997
Colorado	294,828
Connecticut	644,339
Delaware	85,992
Florida	539,842
Georgia	660,664
Idaho	120,693
Illinois	2,725,923
Indiana	1,030,929
Iowa	483,487
Kansas	388,641
Kentucky	557,877
Louisiana	496,386
Maine	256,311
Maryland	541,786
Massachusetts	1,632,952
Michigan	1,807,056
Minnesota	651,345
Mississippi	275,142
Missouri	1,020,197
Montana	139,013
Nebraska	255,827
Nevada	35,786
New Hampshire	165,505
New Jersey	1,414,793
New Mexico	88,425
New York	5,295,888
North Carolina	757,431
North Dakota	84,053
Ohio	2,284,968
Oklahoma	519,248
Oregon	315,341
Pennsylvania	3,340,036
Rhode Island	279,844
South Carolina	396,762
South Dakota	98,207
Tennessee	601,378
Texas	1,539,182
Utah	141,298
Vermont	89,664
Virginia	575,105
Washington	531,071
West Virginia	519,637
Wisconsin	788,217
Wyoming	60,918
District of Columbia	239,390
Alaska	16,491
Hawaii	123,489
Total	38,237,877

TABLE 2.—Lump-sum payments under Federal old-age insurance, as of Mar. 31, 1938

Place of origin	Claims certified in March	Total number of claims certified, January 1937-March 1938	Amount of payments in March	Total amounts of payments, January 1937-March 1938	Average payments in March
Total	21,858	114,927	\$836,867.87	\$3,425,234.44	\$38.29
Region I (total)	2,040	13,009	\$2,770.45	\$85,618.18	40.57
Connecticut	511	3,007	22,865.32	95,937.79	44.75
Maine	144	930	4,839.49	22,624.01	33.61
Massachusetts	1,008	6,628	42,047.36	202,521.54	41.71
New Hampshire	111	688	3,211.44	15,910.76	28.93
Rhode Island	209	1,356	7,894.96	38,570.08	37.77
Vermont	57	400	1,911.88	10,054.00	33.54
Region II: New York	2,535	13,448	\$14,381.45	\$457,849.82	45.12
Region III (total)	3,050	19,702	\$134,980.37	\$615,490.27	44.26
Delaware	62	394	2,985.26	12,099.08	48.15
New Jersey	843	5,516	30,869.93	188,413.89	47.30
Pennsylvania	2,145	13,792	92,125.18	414,977.30	42.95

TABLE 2.—Lump-sum payments under Federal old-age insurance, as of Mar. 31, 1938—Continued

Place of origin	Claims certified in March	Total number of claims certified, January 1937-March 1938	Amount of payments in March	Total amounts of payments, January 1937-March 1938	Average payments in March
Region IV (total)	1,588	8,445	\$50,770.46	\$215,995.42	\$31.97
District of Columbia	143	597	5,406.52	18,839.28	37.81
Maryland	327	1,955	12,551.56	59,145.94	38.38
North Carolina	431	2,380	11,114.86	48,262.86	25.79
Virginia	391	1,924	11,245.53	47,234.36	28.76
West Virginia	296	1,589	10,451.99	42,512.98	35.31
Region V (total)	2,876	15,226	\$113,100.78	\$466,183.72	39.33
Kentucky	286	1,327	7,939.68	33,434.65	27.76
Michigan	1,050	5,102	41,419.44	158,339.71	39.45
Ohio	1,540	8,797	63,741.66	274,409.36	41.39
Region VI (total)	2,396	14,502	\$95,337.32	\$439,824.23	39.79
Illinois	1,300	7,792	53,102.39	248,416.39	40.85
Indiana	622	3,719	23,342.42	104,290.33	37.53
Wisconsin	474	2,991	18,892.51	87,117.51	39.86
Region VII (total)	1,807	6,290	\$48,027.38	\$139,721.98	26.58
Alabama	365	1,407	10,043.32	30,861.45	27.52
Florida	228	752	7,128.49	18,870.22	31.27
Georgia	364	1,430	9,537.82	32,245.97	26.20
Mississippi	119	382	2,987.11	7,868.63	25.10
South Carolina	300	902	6,259.71	16,177.69	20.87
Tennessee	431	1,417	12,070.93	33,698.01	28.01
Region VIII (total)	875	3,258	\$4,203.50	\$7,102.33	\$9.09
Iowa	280	1,080	9,896.52	29,493.18	35.34
Minnesota	377	1,479	16,362.66	46,766.67	43.40
Nebraska	143	466	5,479.01	14,623.56	38.31
North Dakota	35	103	1,337.61	2,997.36	38.22
South Dakota	40	130	1,127.70	3,221.56	28.19
Region IX (total)	1,309	5,501	\$42,855.11	\$154,991.85	\$32.97
Arkansas	204	594	3,857.43	12,058.03	18.91
Kansas	285	997	7,206.56	25,044.76	25.29
Missouri	597	3,027	23,429.60	89,460.75	39.25
Oklahoma	214	883	8,361.52	28,428.31	39.07
Region X (total)	1,138	4,319	\$32,898.67	\$114,690.21	\$28.91
Louisiana	273	1,013	8,359.67	27,278.36	30.62
New Mexico	110	224	1,424.33	4,061.42	12.95
Texas	755	3,082	23,114.67	83,350.43	30.62
Region XI (total)	430	2,559	\$15,523.20	\$71,874.15	\$36.10
Arizona	60	262	2,129.55	6,854.47	25.49
Colorado	128	936	5,035.57	26,394.05	39.34
Idaho	69	281	1,744.35	7,194.14	25.28
Montana	87	505	3,626.65	16,123.41	41.69
Utah	60	430	2,263.84	11,999.97	37.73
Wyoming	26	145	723.24	3,308.11	27.82
Region XII (total)	1,787	8,497	\$70,360.24	\$260,676.89	\$39.37
California	1,133	5,440	45,713.06	174,513.30	40.35
Nevada	23	122	1,503.68	4,027.22	65.38
Oregon	221	1,046	7,867.73	28,982.20	35.60
Washington	410	1,889	15,275.77	53,154.17	37.26
Alaska	6	17	255.83	634.72	42.64
Hawaii	12	84	437.49	2,184.76	36.46
Foreign	18	70	965.62	2,395.91	53.65

TABLE 3.—Benefits under Federal old-age insurance
[Examples of monthly payments scheduled to begin in January 1942]

Average monthly salary	Years of employment							
	5	10	15	20	25	30	40	45
\$25	(1)	\$15.00	\$16.25	\$17.50	\$18.75	\$20.00	\$21.25	\$22.50
\$50	\$15.00	17.50	20.00	22.50	25.00	27.50	30.00	32.50
\$75	16.25	20.00	23.75	27.50	31.25	35.00	38.75	42.50
\$100	17.50	22.50	27.50	32.50	37.50	42.50	47.50	52.50
\$125	18.75	25.00	31.25	37.50	43.75	50.00	56.25	62.50
\$150	20.00	27.50	35.00	42.50	50.00	57.50	65.00	72.50
\$175	21.25	30.00	38.75	47.50	56.25	65.00	73.75	82.50
\$200	22.50	32.50	42.50	51.25	61.25	71.25	81.25	91.25
\$225	23.75	35.00	46.25	56.25	66.25	76.25	86.25	96.25
\$250	25.00	37.50	50.00	62.50	75.00	87.50	100.00	112.50

¹ Lump-sum payment of \$52.50.

² Only \$3,000 a year counted.

Examples of lump-sum payments

	Lump-sum benefit at age 65 or payment to estate if worker dies before receiving benefits				
	After 6 months' work	After 1 year's work	After 2 years' work	After 3 years' work	After 4 years' work
Average week's pay:					
\$10.....	\$9.10	\$18.20	\$36.40	\$54.60	\$72.80
\$12.....	10.92	21.84	43.68	65.52	87.36
\$15.....	13.65	27.30	54.60	81.90	109.20
\$18.....	16.38	32.76	65.52	98.28	131.04
\$21.....	19.11	38.22	76.44	114.66	152.88
\$25.....	22.75	45.50	91.00	136.50	182.00
\$30.....	27.30	54.60	109.20	163.80	218.40
\$40.....	36.40	72.80	145.60	218.40	291.20
\$50.....	45.50	91.00	182.00	273.00	364.00
\$60 ¹	54.60	109.20	210.00	315.00	420.00

¹ Only \$3,000 a year counted.

NOTE.—Lump-sum payments equal 3½ percent of total wages from covered employment, between Dec. 31, 1936, and the time the worker dies or becomes 65. If a worker's wages which count toward benefits have been received from employment in 5 years after 1936 and before he reaches age 65, and if such wages amount to \$2,000 or more, he will receive his benefits in the form of monthly retirement income instead of as a lump sum.

TABLE 4.—Estimated number of persons employed as of Dec. 15, 1937, in jobs covered by State unemployment compensation laws

States with approved laws:	
Alabama.....	276,000
Arizona.....	71,000
Arkansas.....	143,000
California.....	1,059,000
Colorado.....	148,000
Connecticut.....	357,000
Delaware.....	47,000
District of Columbia.....	155,000
Florida.....	241,000
Georgia.....	313,000
Idaho.....	72,000
Illinois.....	1,447,000
Indiana.....	495,000
Iowa.....	247,000
Kansas.....	198,000
Kentucky.....	302,000
Louisiana.....	210,000
Maine.....	93,000
Maryland.....	295,000
Massachusetts.....	714,000
Michigan.....	886,000
Minnesota.....	408,000
Mississippi.....	103,000
Missouri.....	535,000
Montana.....	75,000
Nebraska.....	132,000
Nevada.....	21,000
New Hampshire.....	82,000
New Jersey.....	744,000
New Mexico.....	46,000
New York.....	2,342,000
North Carolina.....	422,000
North Dakota.....	35,000
Ohio.....	1,143,000
Oklahoma.....	207,000
Oregon.....	156,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,808,000
Rhode Island.....	130,000
South Carolina.....	187,000
South Dakota.....	37,000
Tennessee.....	280,000
Texas.....	620,000
Utah.....	71,000
Vermont.....	42,000
Virginia.....	294,000
Washington.....	262,000
West Virginia.....	283,000
Wisconsin.....	434,000
Wyoming.....	40,000
Total.....	18,708,000

(1) These estimates indicate current actual employment on the date specified. They do not represent the total coverage of workers for unemployment compensation purposes; that is, the number of workers who, by reason of past or present employment, have accrued or are accruing rights to benefits under State laws. Because of labor turn-over, the number of workers having accounts in the unemployment compensation agencies of each State may be from 25 to 50 percent larger than the number employed in covered industries on a particular date.

(2) Alaska, Hawaii, current figures are not available. Estimates based on Federal census of April 1930 give approximately 43,000 workers in Hawaii and 15,500 in Alaska in employments of a type now covered by unemployment compensation. The number of

covered jobs probably doubles in Alaska during the summer months, when there is a large influx of migratory workers.

TABLE 5.—Unemployment compensation, benefit payments as of Apr. 2, 1938

State	Number of checks issued	Amount of checks issued
Alabama.....	203,221	\$1,389,627.00
Arizona.....	29,809	370,095.84
California.....	286,237	2,723,840.69
Connecticut.....	364,799	3,805,046.75
District of Columbia.....	28,946	250,644.50
Louisiana.....	56,732	361,368.00
Maine.....	113,774	963,729.53
Maryland.....	1280,392	2,471,087.50
Massachusetts.....	556,589	5,850,954.00
Minnesota.....	130,877	1,424,243.41
New Hampshire.....	74,808	647,986.00
New York.....	1,259,839	14,471,896.73
North Carolina.....	1340,490	1,585,789.85
Oregon.....	132,266	1,565,287.04
Pennsylvania.....	1,387,729	15,758,677.30
Rhode Island.....	356,898	3,154,721.62
Tennessee.....	168,743	1,177,731.69
Texas.....	134,464	1,230,949.89
Utah.....	65,954	746,412.77
Vermont.....	33,161	238,165.59
Virginia.....	11,352	83,374.89
West Virginia.....	290,081	2,835,711.63
Wisconsin.....	326,492	3,043,386.25
Total.....	6,633,663	66,200,728.47

¹ Represents number of compensable weeks paid rather than the number of checks issued. This is due to the use of multipayment checks, in which payment for several weeks back may be included in the same check.

The number of checks issued gives no indication of the number of individuals who may be receiving compensation since it includes successive weekly payments to the same individuals. It is also not to be used to secure an estimate of the average weekly benefit since the total amount paid includes benefits both for total unemployment and for partial unemployment in those States in which partial benefits are payable. Furthermore, in a few instances, State agencies have made lump-sum payments in one check covering two or more compensable weeks.

TABLE 6.—Unemployment trust fund as of Mar. 31, 1938

	Deposits	Earnings	With- drawals	Balance
Alabama.....	\$9,657,881.13	\$159,536.96	\$2,000,000	\$7,817,418.09
Alaska.....	330,390.76	1,404.29		331,795.05
Arizona.....	2,227,108.06	33,786.63	525,000	1,735,894.69
Arkansas.....	2,163,066.73	24,374.71		2,187,441.44
California.....	72,954,400.00	1,251,472.56	7,500,000	66,705,872.56
Colorado.....	5,206,898.12	87,511.26		5,294,409.38
Connecticut.....	16,918,000.00	278,057.93	4,250,000	12,946,057.93
Delaware.....	1,610,000.00	9,830.71		1,619,830.71
District of Columbia.....	6,841,826.06	142,394.82	275,000	6,709,220.88
Florida.....	3,890,000.00	28,807.18		3,918,807.18
Georgia.....	6,150,000.00	46,062.93		6,196,062.93
Hawaii.....	1,334,541.78	6,583.70		1,341,125.48
Idaho.....	2,075,978.15	34,982.29		2,110,960.44
Illinois.....	39,000,000.00	126,139.20		39,126,139.20
Indiana.....	26,576,164.74	516,462.19		27,092,626.93
Iowa.....	7,900,000.00	114,475.22		8,014,475.22
Kansas.....	4,067,600.86	48,332.78		4,115,933.64
Kentucky.....	10,782,000.00	151,768.26		10,933,768.26
Louisiana.....	9,075,000.00	142,251.65	400,000	8,817,251.65
Maine.....	4,050,000.00	66,832.97	1,000,000	3,116,832.97
Maryland.....	10,800,000.00	150,940.78	2,800,000	8,150,940.78
Massachusetts.....	47,300,000.00	791,865.10	7,000,000	41,091,865.10
Michigan.....	51,601,001.32	650,190.63		52,251,191.95
Minnesota.....	13,150,000.00	192,807.08	1,500,000	11,842,807.08
Mississippi.....	2,677,725.85	48,442.58		2,726,168.43
Missouri.....	13,200,000.00	48,538.44		13,248,538.44
Montana.....	2,000,000.00	19,113.05		2,019,113.05
Nebraska.....	2,562,500.00	18,404.57		2,580,904.57
Nevada.....	702,135.83	7,214.41		709,350.24
New Hampshire.....	4,571,312.59	82,552.51	920,000	3,733,865.10
New Jersey.....	33,446,000.00	566,843.60		34,012,843.60
New Mexico.....	1,300,000.00	23,355.69		1,323,355.69
New York.....	114,500,000.00	2,217,060.43	15,000,000	101,717,060.43
North Carolina.....	11,400,000.00	181,921.09	1,900,000	9,681,921.09
North Dakota.....	750,000.00	7,567.96		757,567.96
Ohio.....	61,344,933.05	880,681.71		62,225,614.76
Oklahoma.....	7,860,000.00	125,690.66		7,985,690.66
Oregon.....	7,048,240.51	130,088.23	2,000,000	5,178,328.74
Pennsylvania.....	85,332,000.00	1,338,522.91	16,000,000	70,670,522.91
Rhode Island.....	9,616,012.59	169,394.63	3,500,000	6,275,407.22
South Carolina.....	5,075,000.00	86,001.81		5,161,001.81
South Dakota.....	1,100,000.00	19,131.75		1,119,131.75
Tennessee.....	8,420,000.00	134,320.42	1,500,000	7,054,320.42
Texas.....	23,355,000.00	386,402.06	1,500,000	22,241,402.06
Utah.....	2,668,367.70	46,237.17	1,020,000	1,694,604.87
Vermont.....	1,577,400.58	25,452.30	325,000	1,277,852.88
Virginia.....	9,550,000.00	149,292.68	1,350,000	8,349,292.68
Washington.....	7,775,000.00	79,213.04		7,854,213.04
West Virginia.....	11,289,467.76	158,542.09	3,200,000	8,248,009.85
Wisconsin.....	35,085,581.31	1,025,162.46	5,000,000	31,110,743.77
Wyoming.....	1,000,000.00	10,489.18		1,010,489.18
Total.....	820,868,535.48	13,032,499.26	80,465,000	753,436,034.74

TABLE 7.—Total unemployment compensation and employment service grants, December 1936–Apr. 5, 1938

Alabama.....	\$725,628.96
Arizona.....	267,726.46
Arkansas.....	202,458.27
California.....	3,431,316.28
Colorado.....	169,461.51
Connecticut.....	888,664.84
Delaware.....	117,530.22
District of Columbia.....	420,039.78
Florida.....	161,372.00
Georgia.....	237,175.24
Idaho.....	210,641.41
Illinois.....	276,652.06
Indiana.....	1,546,224.69
Iowa.....	303,191.95
Kansas.....	148,458.46
Kentucky.....	271,652.90
Louisiana.....	663,297.05
Maine.....	507,869.89
Maryland.....	681,870.96
Massachusetts.....	2,376,962.93
Michigan.....	871,559.64
Minnesota.....	1,095,427.61
Mississippi.....	322,698.74
Missouri.....	160,924.68
Montana.....	114,625.76
Nebraska.....	98,259.93
Nevada.....	108,612.80
New Hampshire.....	599,079.02
New Jersey.....	732,269.12
New Mexico.....	85,572.98
New York.....	7,315,408.33
North Carolina.....	916,893.32
North Dakota.....	125,084.30
Ohio.....	620,347.58
Oklahoma.....	284,369.95
Oregon.....	644,428.73
Pennsylvania.....	6,886,990.95
Rhode Island.....	617,977.14
South Carolina.....	346,407.49
South Dakota.....	132,846.33
Tennessee.....	587,416.09
Texas.....	2,045,278.43
Utah.....	325,637.71
Vermont.....	240,556.77
Virginia.....	712,929.86
Washington.....	144,865.76
West Virginia.....	666,086.58
Wisconsin.....	1,655,274.09
Wyoming.....	86,287.91
Alaska.....	33,051.21
Hawaii.....	83,898.49
Total.....	42,269,063.16

TABLE 8.—Statistics of public assistance under the Social Security Act for February 1938

[Data corrected to Mar. 25, 1938]

States with plans approved by the Social Security Board	Number of recipients ¹ of public assistance for February 1938			
	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind
		Families	Children	
Total.....	1,632,802	225,273	558,543	46,401
1. Alabama.....	14,498	5,236	15,642	385
2. Alaska.....	759			
3. Arizona.....	5,559	1,486	4,369	261
4. Arkansas.....	19,341	4,759	12,569	677
5. California.....	104,201	11,406	28,243	5,451
6. Colorado.....	35,314	3,414	8,936	581
7. Connecticut.....	14,288			
8. Delaware.....	2,785	467	1,088	
9. District of Columbia.....	25,923	1,274	3,762	192
10. Florida.....	26,593			373
11. Georgia.....	25,923	3,443	9,639	878
12. Hawaii.....	1,588	918	3,119	170
13. Idaho.....	8,325	2,395	5,656	282
14. Illinois.....	121,482			
15. Indiana.....	42,042	12,520	27,092	2,263
16. Iowa.....	45,917			738
17. Kansas.....	16,637	3,548	8,752	600

¹ The number reported in each column is the number of individuals whose applications for public assistance have been approved formally. This number is less than the total number of persons in households receiving public assistance under the Social Security Act. For other statistical information for February see the section of the Social Security Bulletin entitled "Public Assistance, Statistics for the United States," published by the Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Division of Public Assistance Research.

² Preliminary figures, subject to revision.

TABLE 8.—Statistics of public assistance under the Social Security Act for February 1938—Continued

States with plans approved by the Social Security Board	Number of recipients of public assistance for February 1938			
	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind
		Families	Children	
18. Kentucky.....	33,959			
19. Louisiana.....	24,930	8,326	24,120	580
20. Maine.....	2,583	1,327	3,549	1,275
21. Maryland.....	16,515	6,853	19,274	569
22. Massachusetts.....	66,577	7,702	19,406	1,027
23. Michigan.....	70,487	12,512	28,853	545
24. Minnesota.....	62,973	4,909	12,648	541
25. Mississippi.....	15,321			
26. Missouri.....	74,073	423	1,246	
27. Montana.....	11,828	1,772	4,189	10
28. Nebraska.....	26,049	4,116	9,699	559
29. Nevada.....	1,699			
30. New Hampshire.....	3,683	361	1,012	297
31. New Jersey.....	25,778	11,084	24,832	554
32. New Mexico.....	3,829	1,395	4,087	205
33. New York.....	104,297	27,077	56,048	2,382
34. North Carolina.....	24,284	5,283	15,430	1,823
35. North Dakota.....	7,441	577	1,851	93
36. Ohio.....	105,533	10,686	28,550	3,750
37. Oklahoma.....	68,446	14,655	34,084	2,070
38. Oregon.....	15,309	1,099	2,496	430
39. Pennsylvania.....	95,028	17,412	43,662	11,216
40. Rhode Island.....	5,942	846	2,388	
41. South Carolina.....	17,334	2,446	7,308	646
42. South Dakota.....	14,795			2
43. Tennessee.....	19,410	8,242	23,399	778
44. Texas.....	111,617			
45. Utah.....	12,265	2,625	6,405	243
46. Vermont.....	5,486	320	749	149
47. Washington.....	36,692	6,419	13,811	1,023
48. West Virginia.....	18,649	5,520	16,274	751
49. Wisconsin.....	38,784	9,819	22,852	1,975
50. Wyoming.....	2,868	596	1,474	167

¹ Federal funds available, but no payments made for this month.

TABLE 9.—Statistics of public assistance under the Social Security Act for February 1938

[Data corrected to Mar. 25, 1938]

States with plans approved by the Social Security Board	Amount of obligations incurred for payments to recipients of public assistance for February 1938 ¹			
	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind
Total.....	\$39,982,074	\$31,585,365	\$7,214,000	\$1,182,818
1. Alabama.....	228,258	156,527	67,948	3,783
2. Alaska.....	21,460			
3. Arizona.....	195,311	141,143	48,003	6,165
4. Arkansas.....	232,524	176,809	49,564	6,151
5. California.....	4,111,147	3,429,742	419,713	261,692
6. Colorado.....	1,238,657	1,116,993	105,646	16,145
7. Connecticut.....	339,216	339,216		
8. Delaware.....	45,230	30,133	15,097	
9. District of Columbia.....	147,192	78,073	64,059	5,060
10. Florida.....	420,030	413,919		6,111
11. Georgia.....	336,143	249,503	76,136	10,504
12. Hawaii.....	50,896	19,946	30,301	1,649
13. Idaho.....	248,140	179,777	62,000	6,363
14. Illinois.....	2,088,828	2,088,828		
15. Indiana.....	1,071,645	677,831	351,281	42,533
16. Iowa.....	926,284	908,943		17,341
17. Kansas.....	433,687	317,059	103,848	12,780
18. Kentucky.....	318,545	318,545		
19. Louisiana.....	426,033	247,004	171,538	7,491
20. Maine.....	132,438	54,076	49,805	28,557
21. Maryland.....	522,487	290,487	220,286	11,714
22. Massachusetts.....	2,350,227	1,864,402	465,144	20,681
23. Michigan.....	1,828,968	1,331,920	482,736	14,312
24. Minnesota.....	1,425,626	1,243,784	170,547	11,295
25. Mississippi.....	70,058			
26. Missouri.....	1,080,304	1,072,037	14,267	
27. Montana.....	289,846	240,763	49,083	10
28. Nebraska.....	572,777	444,495	117,213	11,069
29. Nevada.....	46,432			
30. New Hampshire.....	102,594	82,735	13,636	6,205
31. New Jersey.....	807,770	471,534	323,901	12,335
32. New Mexico.....	87,588	48,554	35,728	3,306
33. New York.....	8,846,291	2,490,909	1,300,660	54,722
34. North Carolina.....	338,232	227,654	84,655	25,923

¹ Amount of payments to recipients from Federal, State, and local funds, administrative expense excluded. For other statistical information for February see the section of the Social Security Bulletin entitled "Public Assistance, Statistics for the United States," published by the Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Division of Public Assistance Research.

² Preliminary figures, subject to revision.

³ Federal funds available, but no payments made for this month.

TABLE 9.—Statistics of public assistance under the Social Security Act for February 1938—Continued

States with plans approved by the Social Security Board	Amount of obligations incurred for payments to recipients of public assistance for February 1938			
	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind
35. North Dakota.....	\$147,869	\$126,342	\$19,862	\$1,665
36. Ohio.....	2,909,972	2,431,712	407,093	71,167
37. Oklahoma.....	1,300,265	1,032,593	232,921	34,751
38. Oregon.....	377,867	327,980	39,048	10,839
39. Pennsylvania.....	2,999,281	2,061,237	602,534	335,510
40. Rhode Island.....	152,196	109,933	42,263	—
41. South Carolina.....	245,004	186,368	49,900	8,736
42. South Dakota.....	276,597	276,546	—	51
43. Tennessee.....	432,839	259,114	153,022	11,703
44. Texas.....	1,532,003	1,532,003	—	—
45. Utah.....	408,102	312,736	89,090	6,276
46. Vermont.....	86,912	78,206	6,285	2,421
47. Washington.....	1,085,620	860,635	189,702	35,283
48. West Virginia.....	393,307	260,909	119,211	13,187
49. Wisconsin.....	1,172,723	776,963	352,411	43,349
50. Wyoming.....	83,633	60,797	17,863	4,993

TABLE 10.—Statistics of public assistance under the Social Security Act for February 1938

[Data corrected to Mar. 25, 1938]

States with plans approved by the Social Security Board	Average amount paid to recipients of public assistance for February 1938 ¹		
	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children (average per family)	Aid to the blind
Total.....	\$19.34	\$32.02	\$25.49
1. Alabama.....	10.80	12.98	9.82
2. Alaska.....	28.27	—	—
3. Arizona.....	25.39	32.30	23.62
4. Arkansas.....	9.14	10.41	9.08
5. California.....	32.91	36.80	48.01
6. Colorado.....	31.63	30.94	27.79
7. Connecticut.....	23.74	—	—
8. Delaware.....	10.82	32.33	—
9. District of Columbia.....	25.30	50.28	26.35
10. Florida.....	15.56	—	16.38
11. Georgia.....	9.62	22.08	11.96
12. Hawaii.....	12.56	33.01	9.27
13. Idaho.....	21.59	25.89	22.56
14. Illinois.....	17.19	—	—
15. Indiana.....	16.12	28.06	18.79
16. Iowa.....	19.80	—	23.50
17. Kansas.....	19.06	29.27	21.30
18. Kentucky.....	9.38	—	—
19. Louisiana.....	9.91	20.60	12.91
20. Maine.....	20.94	37.53	22.40
21. Maryland.....	17.59	32.14	20.59
22. Massachusetts.....	28.00	60.39	20.14
23. Michigan.....	18.90	38.58	26.26
24. Minnesota.....	19.75	34.74	20.88
25. Mississippi.....	4.57	—	—
26. Missouri.....	14.47	33.73	—
27. Montana.....	20.35	27.70	0
28. Nebraska.....	17.06	28.48	19.80
29. Nevada.....	27.33	—	—
30. New Hampshire.....	22.46	37.77	20.89
31. New Jersey.....	18.29	29.22	22.27
32. New Mexico.....	12.68	25.61	16.13
33. New York.....	23.88	48.04	22.97
34. North Carolina.....	9.37	16.02	14.22
35. North Dakota.....	16.98	34.42	17.90
36. Ohio.....	23.04	38.10	18.98
37. Oklahoma.....	15.09	15.89	16.79
38. Oregon.....	21.42	35.53	25.21
39. Pennsylvania.....	21.69	34.60	29.91
40. Rhode Island.....	18.50	49.96	—
41. South Carolina.....	10.75	20.40	13.52
42. South Dakota.....	18.69	—	25.75
43. Tennessee.....	13.35	18.57	15.04
44. Texas.....	13.73	—	—
45. Utah.....	25.50	33.94	25.83
46. Vermont.....	14.26	19.64	16.25
47. Washington.....	23.46	29.55	34.49
48. West Virginia.....	13.99	21.60	17.56
49. Wisconsin.....	20.03	35.89	21.95
50. Wyoming.....	21.20	29.97	29.90

¹ Amount of payments to recipients from Federal, State, and local funds, administrative expense excluded. For other statistical information for February see the section of the Social Security Bulletin entitled "Public Assistance, Statistics for the United States," published by the Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Division of Public Assistance Research.

² Preliminary figures, subject to revision.

TABLE 11.—Federal public assistance grants to States, Feb. 1, 1936, to June 30, 1938, as of Apr. 5, 1938

[The amounts given in the following table represent the total Federal funds made available to the States for public assistance. Under the act advances are made to States on the basis of the States' own estimates of their needs for the ensuing quarter. At the end of each quarter these amounts are adjusted on the basis of a Federal audit and of State reports of actual expenditures for prior quarters.]

State	Aged	Blind	Children	Grand total for 3 categories
Alabama.....	\$1,771,050.11	\$31,649.17	\$705,133.09	\$2,507,832.37
Alaska.....	144,458.99	—	—	144,458.99
Arizona.....	686,563.31	56,104.03	356,311.41	1,098,978.75
Arkansas.....	2,109,420.47	77,833.60	426,605.81	2,613,859.88
California.....	27,460,944.08	1,613,728.04	2,395,701.11	31,470,373.23
Colorado.....	10,794,223.16	207,392.98	827,845.11	11,829,461.25
Connecticut.....	3,761,539.10	2,520.00	—	3,764,059.10
Delaware.....	393,476.49	—	109,016.29	502,492.78
District of Columbia.....	—	—	—	—
Florida.....	701,059.50	44,552.39	534,287.59	1,279,899.48
Georgia.....	2,657,461.44	71,820.00	—	2,729,281.44
Hawaii.....	1,127,886.59	42,596.25	232,985.97	1,403,468.81
Idaho.....	167,672.36	8,274.00	135,287.90	309,234.26
Illinois.....	2,607,517.71	90,741.54	528,692.56	3,226,951.81
Indiana.....	21,224,688.16	—	—	21,224,688.16
Iowa.....	7,659,984.65	465,328.05	1,865,883.20	9,991,195.90
Kansas.....	9,086,480.56	91,618.25	—	9,178,098.81
Kentucky.....	866,302.26	41,341.62	224,573.61	1,132,217.39
Louisiana.....	2,951,575.29	—	—	2,951,575.29
Maine.....	2,155,874.25	29,512.59	1,203,075.72	3,388,462.56
Maryland.....	891,851.10	330,534.75	430,971.83	1,653,357.68
Massachusetts.....	3,352,889.37	158,239.42	1,900,015.99	5,411,144.78
Michigan.....	17,168,109.81	257,053.69	1,968,667.61	19,393,831.01
Minnesota.....	11,332,886.62	114,485.20	2,625,499.75	14,072,871.57
Mississippi.....	15,333,324.82	71,994.83	585,375.72	15,990,695.37
Missouri.....	1,092,607.42	—	5,791.98	1,105,483.93
Montana.....	10,982,439.38	—	226,800.00	11,209,239.38
Nebraska.....	2,065,472.71	6,300.00	157,842.17	2,229,614.88
Nevada.....	5,542,722.17	138,934.97	755,714.36	6,437,371.50
New Hampshire.....	236,561.17	—	—	236,561.17
New Jersey.....	1,062,370.72	85,910.52	127,328.37	1,275,609.61
New Mexico.....	5,519,156.69	138,791.33	2,779,497.67	8,437,445.69
New York.....	447,064.59	27,113.14	196,306.01	670,483.74
North Carolina.....	21,104,474.24	354,843.53	3,174,179.00	24,633,496.77
North Dakota.....	1,190,088.87	158,953.92	340,369.66	1,689,412.45
Ohio.....	1,400,401.30	17,718.75	114,216.00	1,532,336.05
Oklahoma.....	32,231,963.26	786,664.09	2,500,557.47	35,519,184.82
Oregon.....	8,350,216.92	171,511.73	984,059.66	9,505,788.31
Pennsylvania.....	3,936,900.74	122,888.86	176,325.84	4,236,115.44
Rhode Island.....	15,180,975.19	3,346,388.51	2,824,710.21	21,352,073.91
South Carolina.....	1,083,350.88	—	163,649.82	1,247,000.70
South Dakota.....	828,289.67	43,790.33	138,715.01	1,010,795.01
Tennessee.....	2,125,390.94	7,875.00	—	2,133,265.94
Texas.....	1,087,829.21	52,018.25	566,961.94	2,706,809.40
Utah.....	19,066,414.43	—	—	19,066,414.43
Vermont.....	2,702,672.87	82,023.45	69,307.36	3,478,003.68
Washington.....	859,386.11	25,243.41	60,268.35	944,897.87
West Virginia.....	9,548,155.38	331,511.83	1,833,882.43	11,713,549.64
Wisconsin.....	2,469,880.64	105,754.37	652,715.13	3,228,350.14
Wyoming.....	8,835,659.42	595,112.93	2,102,108.12	11,532,880.47
Total.....	831,251.27	76,923.04	176,925.73	1,085,100.04
Total.....	306,228,936.39	10,490,676.89	37,806,162.36	354,525,775.64

¹ The Mississippi plans for aid to the needy blind and to dependent children, approved Dec. 27, 1935, were based on a law due to expire Mar. 1, 1936. The 1936 regular session of the Mississippi legislature extended this law until Apr. 1, 1936. Upon that date it became inoperative, thereby terminating the plans. The grants were made for the last 2 months of the quarter ending Mar. 31, 1936.

TABLE 12.—Federal grants to States for public-health work, fiscal year 1937-38, to Dec. 31, 1937

Alabama.....	\$145,000
Alaska.....	17,500
Arizona.....	29,900
Arkansas.....	97,700
California.....	150,300
Colorado.....	47,500
Connecticut.....	46,500
Delaware.....	17,600
District of Columbia.....	33,800
Florida.....	64,200
Georgia.....	152,100
Hawaii.....	32,400
Idaho.....	35,900
Illinois.....	181,200
Indiana.....	83,500
Iowa.....	92,500
Kansas.....	52,900
Kentucky.....	124,300
Louisiana.....	89,000
Maine.....	35,600
Maryland.....	68,000
Massachusetts.....	114,500
Michigan.....	145,700
Minnesota.....	101,800
Mississippi.....	106,400

TABLE 12.—Federal grants to States for public-health work, fiscal year 1937-38, to Dec. 31, 1937—Continued

Missouri.....	\$89,500
Montana.....	20,200
Nebraska.....	30,100
Nevada.....	15,300
New Hampshire.....	19,100
New Jersey.....	103,200
New Mexico.....	44,000
New York.....	324,800
North Carolina.....	167,800
North Dakota.....	28,600
Ohio.....	184,700
Oklahoma.....	113,300
Oregon.....	44,000
Pennsylvania.....	213,100
Rhode Island.....	30,100
South Carolina.....	104,400
South Dakota.....	40,000
Tennessee.....	143,600
Texas.....	198,100
Utah.....	35,000
Vermont.....	23,500
Virginia.....	116,100
Washington.....	63,300
West Virginia.....	78,900
Wisconsin.....	92,800
Wyoming.....	13,000
Total.....	4,401,800

TABLE 13.—Federal grants to States under programs of the Social Security Act administered by Children's Bureau—Checks issued by Treasury Department in the fiscal year 1937-38 to Feb. 28, 1938

	Maternal and child-health services	Services for crippled children	Child-welfare services
Alabama.....	\$80,700	\$52,500	\$29,100
Alaska.....	10,500	3,500	5,700
Arizona.....	37,600	17,800	(¹)
Arkansas.....	38,600	35,600	18,100
California.....	89,600	40,600	19,800
Colorado.....	38,100	9,300	15,800
Connecticut.....	25,400	26,100	9,300
Delaware.....	21,600	3,200	7,500
District of Columbia.....	28,100	19,400	6,700
Florida.....	55,100	28,800	21,700
Georgia.....	95,500	2,800	28,800
Hawaii.....	27,600	9,300	8,700
Idaho.....	27,900	10,800	10,700
Illinois.....	91,200	85,100	39,300
Indiana.....	56,800	21,600	23,800
Iowa.....	38,200	44,000	23,000
Kansas.....	27,400	26,400	16,200
Kentucky.....	62,900	52,800	34,200
Louisiana.....	65,300	(²)	19,400
Maine.....	24,400	20,200	13,900
Maryland.....	41,700	33,800	8,300
Massachusetts.....	56,200	63,400	8,700
Michigan.....	74,700	70,500	29,400
Minnesota.....	50,500	48,000	25,900
Mississippi.....	63,300	20,600	(³)
Missouri.....	46,600	42,200	30,000
Montana.....	33,200	21,400	15,500
Nebraska.....	17,900	38,200	18,100
Nevada.....	26,700	800	10,200
New Hampshire.....	18,300	8,900	8,700
New Jersey.....	56,800	35,000	15,900
New Mexico.....	43,200	23,900	6,700
New York.....	131,700	101,500	37,100
North Carolina.....	90,800	55,200	49,600
North Dakota.....	32,600	37,100	11,300
Ohio.....	79,700	101,400	28,200
Oklahoma.....	65,800	58,800	31,600
Oregon.....	36,300	12,100	16,400
Pennsylvania.....	108,100	153,400	39,400
Rhode Island.....	27,700	27,700	(⁴)
South Carolina.....	74,200	23,900	24,600
South Dakota.....	28,700	24,900	14,100
Tennessee.....	68,900	30,400	38,600
Texas.....	97,200	86,200	48,900
Utah.....	20,300	15,900	4,200
Vermont.....	24,400	13,700	10,500
Virginia.....	75,000	46,600	38,100
Washington.....	33,700	38,100	15,300
West Virginia.....	34,800	37,300	28,800
Wisconsin.....	46,800	52,000	30,100
Wyoming.....	5,600	2,000	(⁵)
Total.....	2,559,900	1,837,900	995,900

¹ Plan approved only for first month of fiscal year. No funds.² Refund of unexpended grant.³ No plan approved by Chief, Children's Bureau.⁴ Plan approved Mar. 5, 1938.⁵ Plan approved Mar. 10, 1938.⁶ No plan approved by Chief, Children's Bureau.

TABLE 14.—Vocational rehabilitation, cases on live roll, fiscal year ending June 30, 1937

Alabama.....	774
Arizona.....	282
Arkansas.....	431
California.....	2,413
Colorado.....	265
Connecticut.....	294
District of Columbia.....	322
Florida.....	588
Georgia.....	1,223
Hawaii.....	140
Idaho.....	150
Illinois.....	1,284
Indiana.....	1,856
Iowa.....	456
Kentucky.....	497
Louisiana.....	1,316
Maine.....	162
Maryland.....	373
Massachusetts.....	781
Michigan.....	1,618
Minnesota.....	2,436
Mississippi.....	1,276
Missouri.....	707
Montana.....	360
Nebraska.....	254
Nevada.....	84
New Hampshire.....	216
New Jersey.....	1,303
New Mexico.....	101
New York.....	2,577
North Carolina.....	1,301
North Dakota.....	238
Ohio.....	999
Oklahoma.....	1,008
Oregon.....	411
Pennsylvania.....	2,354
Puerto Rico.....	301
Rhode Island.....	181
South Carolina.....	742
South Dakota.....	110
Tennessee.....	1,933
Texas.....	2,547
Utah.....	184
Virginia.....	1,169
Washington.....	366
West Virginia.....	560
Wisconsin.....	2,943
Wyoming.....	169
Total.....	42,055

These show amazing results in the short time the Social Security Act has been in existence. Since old-age insurance is federally administered, it is, of course, in effect in every part of the country. But in the other nine programs included in the act—where nothing happens without State action—the record is also nearing completion. Thirty-six States have approved plans for all nine of these Federal-State programs—unemployment compensation, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, public health, maternal and child health, services to crippled children, child welfare, and vocational rehabilitation. Six States lack but one program; and another eight lack two. The only State, Virginia, still lacking as many as three has recently passed legislation to enable it to take full part in the act. In summary, State participation already stands at about 95 percent of the potential total, and we may take it for granted that the record will be 100 percent complete in the very near future.

But calling the roll of the States is about like naming the bones in the human body. It is a skeleton picture. You cannot really gage this progress unless you look at it State by State.

Take my own State of North Carolina, for example. Prior to Federal cooperation, it goes without saying that we had nothing like old-age insurance. But we also had no old-age assistance, no aid to the blind, no unemployment compensation. We had, like most other States, made piecemeal efforts in some directions; we did provide some help for children and various public-health services. But even these were nothing like what we have now.

As against that, consider this picture: Today old-age insurance accounts have been set up for about 750,000 North

Carolina workers. Nearly 2,500 claims for lump-sum benefits have already been certified in my State for workers who have reached 65 since January 1, 1937, and for the survivors of those who have died since that time. The total amount of these benefits already comes to about \$50,000. But this is only the preliminary. After 1942, practically every industrial and commercial wage earner in North Carolina, as in every other State in the Union, will receive a lifetime income when he reaches 65 and retires from regular employment.

North Carolina passed its unemployment compensation law in December 1936; and I am informed that, as of December 15, 1937, 422,000 North Carolina workers were in jobs covered by it. The number who, because of employment before or after that date, may also be covered is probably considerably higher. Benefits became payable last January under the North Carolina law, and by April 16 over 435,000 checks, representing total benefits of over \$2,000,000 had been issued to unemployed workers by our North Carolina Unemployment Compensation Commission. These benefits are paid out of our own State unemployment compensation fund, to which North Carolina employers have been contributing for the past 2 years. Today there is around \$10,000,000 in this trust fund. This money is on deposit in the United States Treasury, to be drawn on by the State at will, but only for the purpose of paying unemployment compensation benefits. The Federal Government pays the cost of administration, and North Carolina has already received over \$900,000 in Federal grants for this purpose.

North Carolina has been cooperating in public assistance under the Social Security Act for only 9 months. Whereas before that time it made no specific provision for aiding the aged or blind, today about 27,500 of its needy old folks are getting cash allowances and 1,830 of the blind are receiving similar payments. In addition, 19,000 dependent children are being helped. As against the 300 families with dependent children aided in January 1936, the 6,500 now receiving this assistance represent a twenty-two-fold increase. All this has been made possible because of Federal cooperation. Since July 1937, our first month of participation, North Carolina has received a total of \$1,689,400 for these three programs: \$1,190,000 for old-age assistance; \$159,000 for aid to the blind; \$340,400 for aid to dependent children. To these funds the State adds its own money, as stipulated in the act. In April its total assistance expenditures from combined Federal, State, and local funds comes to \$388,600, exclusive of administrative expense. For old-age assistance, it is spending \$258,500; for aid to the blind, \$26,100; for aid to dependent children, \$104,000.

Beside all this, we now have Federal funds to add to our own State money for public health, child welfare, and vocational rehabilitation. For the current fiscal year we have already received upward of \$400,000 in Federal grants for these purposes.

That is what the Social Security Act has enabled the State of North Carolina to do for its own people. Because the act is a State as well as a National program, the over-all picture for the entire country is simply a composite of 48 similar State pictures. These differ from the picture I have just given you of North Carolina, as conditions and needs vary from State to State. But they all add up to one conclusion: Federal cooperation has at last made it possible for each and every State to begin doing for its own people what it has long wanted to do—and could not do alone. It has recognized the right of each and every State to share in Nation-wide protection, as it shares in Nation-wide problems.

As I have already stated, I have before me detailed data on the progress of social security in every single State. And for the information of other Members of the House, I shall ask permission to include these in the record of my remarks. Meantime I should like to give you, very briefly, a summary of progress for the Nation as a whole. The best way to measure the results of any program is by making a before-and-after comparison.

For old-age insurance that comparison is brief and conclusive. Prior to January 1, 1937, when the present Federal system became effective under the terms of the Social Security Act, social insurance against insecurity in old age was nonexistent in this country. You may recall that preliminary estimates gaged the initial coverage under the proposed insurance plan at about 26,000,000 workers. These estimates were soon exceeded, and by the end of March 1938, 14 months after the plan became effective, a total of over 38,000,000 accounts have been set up, which is 3,000,000 more than it was estimated would be covered by 1980.

Monthly benefits, which constitute the major provision of this program, are scheduled to begin in 1942. These lifetime payments will be made to covered workers who have reached 65 and retired from regular employment, provided they meet a few simple requirements. The vast majority, both of those now in the system and of those who enter it in the future, will receive these regular payments for the rest of their lives. According to present estimates, about 175,000 will qualify for annuities under this system in 1942, and by 1950 some 1,680,000 retired workers will be drawing regular payments averaging \$21 a month. If an amendment proposed by the Social Security Board to credit earnings after age 65 should be enacted, about 1,282,000 would qualify for benefits in 1942; and in 1950 the total number of annuitants would be something like 2,205,000.

Supplementing this main provision, the act also provides for lump-sum payments. These go to covered workers who do not qualify for monthly benefits and to the estates of those who die before they have received the minimum amount to which they are entitled. These supplementary benefits became available as soon as the program was inaugurated, and such payments are being made in increasing number to those who have become 65 and to the estates of those who have died since January 1, 1937. By the end of March 1938, about 115,000 lump-sum payments had been made; and an average of 750 more claims are being examined and allowed every day.

In addition to the 38,000,000 workers' accounts set up, identification numbers have also been issued to some 3,000,000 employers. The record keeping required by this vast program is by far the largest job of its kind ever attempted by any organization, private or public. Utilizing and adapting mechanical equipment and methods developed for large-scale business procedures, the Social Security Board has placed this phase of its work on an efficiency basis which is a tribute to American business science and to Federal administrative skill.

Like old-age insurance, unemployment compensation was practically unknown in the United States prior to the passage of the act; for in spite of the fact that 180 unemployment compensation bills had been introduced into 28 State legislatures in the 20 years preceding the Federal Social Security Act only one State, Wisconsin, had succeeded in enacting a law for this purpose. Yet 23 months after the Social Security Act was passed every State in the Union—together with the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska—had enacted an unemployment compensation law and all 51 had been approved by the Social Security Board as conforming to Federal requirements. It is estimated that 19,000,000 workers were employed on December 15, 1937, in jobs covered by these State laws. Because of labor turn-over the total number of workers who have come under the unemployment system is probably 25 to 50 percent larger than this estimate.

Another milestone was passed in January of this year when unemployment benefits became payable in 21 States and the District of Columbia. In Wisconsin, which had begun operations under its law in 1934, benefits have been payable since July 1936. On April 1 two additional States began to accept claims for benefits. Approximately 11,200,000 wage earners—more than half the total covered by all State unemployment compensation provisions—are in the 25 States whose benefit payment programs are already in operation.

Benefits are paid by the States out of their own funds deposited in separate State accounts in the unemployment trust fund in the United States Treasury. At the end of March the total amount in this trust fund came to over \$753,000,000. Reports from the unemployment compensation administrators in these States show that approximately \$90,000,000 in benefit checks have already been issued to unemployed workers through March 30. These funds will, of course, fluctuate with additional deposits, interest accumulations, and periodic withdrawals by the States for benefit payments.

During the later months of 1937 the major concern of both State administrators and the Social Security Board has been the development of the organization and procedures necessary for the payment of benefits. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this development is the Nation-wide tie-up between public employment services and unemployment compensation administration. In all but two jurisdictions unemployment compensation and the public employment service are administered by the same State agency. This coordination of employment services with unemployment compensation is of advantage not only in promoting efficient administration but also in safeguarding the interests of workers, employers, and the public. It recognizes that paying benefits is only one side of the picture and that finding employment is even more important not only for the worker but for all interested parties. By offering an accessible and effective labor exchange it should help to prevent undue drains on State unemployment compensation funds.

Total Federal grants to the States for unemployment compensation administration from February 1936 to April 1938 came to over \$42,000,000. Of this amount, \$31,000,000 was for the expenses of State unemployment compensation agencies and \$11,000,000 for financing the unemployment compensation activities of State employment service.

A problem which has been emphasized by current business conditions relates to the States which were late in passing their unemployment compensation laws. The effective date of benefit payments is dependent upon the provision of the act that no benefits shall be paid until 2 years after the first day with respect to which contributions were required by the State law. Under this provision benefits are now payable in 25 States; they will become payable in 4 more States by or before September, in 20 during December 1938 or January 1939, and in the remaining 2 during the following July. An amendment to the Federal law has been proposed which would permit these States to advance the date of benefit payments. The experience of the States already paying benefits indicates, however, that it will take any State at least 6 months, after its plans are made, to secure adequate personnel and set up administrative machinery.

The advantages of making benefits payable as early as practicable are obvious. But unemployment compensation should not be expected to solve all the problems of unemployment or to meet all present and future need due to this cause. What it can do and what it is intended to do is to bridge the gap between jobs. It thus constitutes a first line of defense against relatively short unemployment—the most frequent emergency encountered by workers in ordinary times. As it achieves this purpose, it will to a great extent conserve the worker's buying power and alleviate the distress and want of families when wage earners are temporarily out of work.

Unlike these two social insurance programs, the three public assistance programs have a long past history. But in spite of a quarter century of State and local public welfare effort, up to 1934 we seemed to be getting nowhere rapidly. In 1934 more than three times as many old people and about two and one-half times as many dependent children were being cared for under the Federal emergency program as under all State and local laws for this purpose. During the next year the States made increasing provision for these forms of assistance; for with congressional consideration of the present plan, many States either passed new public assistance laws or refurbished old ones in anticipation of Federal grants.

Even so, the total number aided by States and their localities in January 1936, the last month before Federal funds became available, was about one-third of the total number being aided by Federal State cooperation today. In January 1936, 30 States gave assistance to some 433,600 needy old people. Today all the States but one are taking part in this provision of the act and are aiding over 1,600,000 old people. In January 1936, 122,000 families with dependent children received help under 39 State mothers' aid laws. Today 225,300 families with over half a million children are being helped in the 40 States cooperating with the Federal Government. Though increases in aid to the blind have been smallest, the number aided rose from about 35,200 to about 47,000 in this 2-year period, and whereas only 26 States were giving this kind of help in January 1936, 41 have approved plans today.

I have no interest in seeing assistance rolls boosted, and I would be the first to insist that there is no virtue in mere numbers. The point is that these people and others like them whom we probably have not yet reached are dependent, regardless of what we do or do not do about it? For very many of them, the public had already assumed the burden of support—in poorhouses and orphanages, through public relief and organized private charity. For most of the remainder—those who were previously supported by families themselves on the brink of destitution—I venture to say that the public has also paid the bill; for every time any family is compelled to jeopardize health and decency in order to provide for its dependent relatives, the chances of future dependency, delinquency and crime go up. One of the major purposes of effective public assistance programs—programs geared, as those of the States increasingly are, to rehabilitation and the conservation of wholesome family life—is to protect present and future generations from the destructive forces that have played upon them all too freely in the past.

Another purpose of a Federal-State public assistance program is to relieve towns and counties and States of a financial burden that had proved unbearable. In 1934 old-age assistance and aid to the blind were not being paid in a full third of the counties where there were State laws for this purpose, and mothers' aid was being given in less than half the local units where it was legally permissible under State law. It was left for county and town poor laws—and eventually for Federal emergency relief—to pick up the pieces as best they could.

Aiding these people—the aged, the blind, the fatherless family—is one of our most important, continuous, and expensive, as well as one of our oldest, welfare obligations. With the Federal Government now contributing approximately one-half the cost of aid to the old and blind and one-third of the expense for dependent children, this burden is more equitably shared. Federal grants for public assistance for the entire period since February 1936 totaled about \$355,000,000 as of April 5. Of this amount nearly \$306,500,000 was for old-age assistance, nearly \$10,500,000 for aid to the blind, and \$38,000,000 aid to dependent children.

The obligations upon combined Federal-State and local funds in the month of February came to nearly \$40,000,000 exclusive of administrative cost. This includes \$31,500,000 for old-age assistance, \$1,200,000 for aid to the blind, and \$7,300,000 for aid to dependent children.

But these are not new costs; one way or another, the public has always paid the bill. The inclusion of these provisions in the Social Security Act simply gives a more orderly, adequate, and economically sound method of handling it. The experience of States and communities during the past 2 years has repeatedly demonstrated what this means not only in extending aid to more of those who need it but also in providing better care and in the more effective use of the available funds.

When, for example, a county orphanage was recently closed—Boone County, Ind.—the local department of welfare took occasion to point out that this would not have been possible without the cooperation of the Federal Government and the State in aiding dependent children. Of the eight children in this county home—a run-down house on the poor

farm—five had relatives who could give them good homes, but could not support them unaided. With the cash allowances now available, these five are again living with their own people—a mother, a grandmother, a sister, an aunt, an uncle.

Of the three remaining, one who was found to be mentally ill, was sent to a State institution where he will receive more adequate care. The other two were orphans. One was placed with a family which plans to adopt her, and the other, an older boy, is in a good foster home on a farm. But the children were not the only ones to benefit. In 1936 the upkeep of this orphanage cost the local taxpayers \$3,680, and expensive repairs on the old house were necessary if it was to continue in use. The total expenditure of public money under the new arrangement is about \$900, of which the county pays about one-third, the remainder coming from Federal and State funds. All the children are immeasurably better off and the local financial burden is less than one-tenth of what it used to be.

Another State, Alabama, has closed 50 of its 63 almshouses during the past 2 years. One-third of their former inmates were transferred to hospitals because their physical or mental condition requires special care. The remaining two-thirds—whose only handicap is that they are old and destitute—are now receiving old-age assistance and can live out their lives in homes of their own choosing, among their families and friends. This movement away from the almshouse did not begin with the Social Security Act, but there can be no question that it has been greatly stimulated by it. Among the States that have closed poorhouses are Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, and West Virginia. Others have reduced their almshouse population. The medieval idea that public institutions should be a catch-all for unfortunates of every description is rapidly becoming as obsolete in fact as it has always been in theory. Institutional care is necessary for some individuals. But at best it is extremely expensive, and at worst it is a menace to human life and a waste of public funds. The practical course—the course our States are now attempting to work out—is to provide cash assistance for the able-bodied and hospitalization for the infirm.

An adequate public-welfare program in any community must include services as well as cash assistance. And here again the Social Security Act has offered the States Federal help. For public health during the current fiscal year Congress has appropriated \$8,000,000 in Federal funds which the United States Health Service allocates to the States. How well this Federal aid is already fulfilling its intended function of stimulating States to an active realization of their health needs is shown by the fact that within the first 18 months after grants become available, the number of full-time county health services had increased by more than 50 percent.

For maternal and child-health services Congress has appropriated \$3,700,000 this year. The Federal Children's Bureau makes grants to all the States, which they are using, together with funds of their own, to safeguard the health of mothers and babies. Anyone who wants proof of how badly this service is needed has only to consider the statement recently issued by the President's committee to coordinate health and welfare activities to the effect that the maternal and infant death toll can be cut in half by more adequate medical and nursing care.

For services to crippled children Congress has appropriated \$2,800,000 this year and the 50 cooperating States and Territories have also made substantial contributions. Probably about six out of every thousand children in the country are crippled—something over 250,000 all told. Some 100,000 have already been registered in 38 States. One of the important services under this program is the locating of crippled children even in remote communities and bringing them in to centers where adequate treatment is available.

For child-welfare services the Federal appropriation for this year was \$1,475,000. With 49 States and Territories receiving Federal grants, better care is being provided for

homeless and neglected children and for those in danger of becoming delinquent. And again this service is being promoted particularly in rural communities where in the past these services have been least adequate.

Finally, Federal cooperation in rehabilitation services, initiated in 1920, has been put on a permanent basis under the Social Security Act. For grants for this purpose, \$1,800,000 has been appropriated for the current year. At the end of the last fiscal year some 43,000 handicapped workers were receiving vocational rehabilitation services in all the States but two, and 11,000 had already completed retraining. The State agencies also maintain close relationship with the State employment services in order to help handicapped workers find suitable jobs. It takes from \$300 to \$500 a year to support an unemployed disabled person, while vocational rehabilitation costs, on the average, slightly less than \$300. The social and economic advantages of helping these people get back on their own feet are obvious.

A student of American history has recently made the comment that our one most consistent characteristic is plain horse sense. Whatever changes have occurred in American Government have had one purpose and one only—to keep it close to facts, to make it better serve the welfare of the people. For that we fought a revolution against the absentee rule of a king. For that we wrote "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" into our Constitution. And for that in our own time we have utilized our Government as an agency of mutual cooperation in order to provide these practical protections which none of us can secure alone.

For that reason, too, in the Social Security Act we have kept the administration of all these services close to the people. In accepting its responsibility in the field of social security, the Federal Government has made no attempt to take over administrative control. Old-age insurance, alone of all the provisions included in the Social Security Act, was placed upon a basis of direct Federal administration—and this only because of convincing proof that no other attack upon this particular problem was feasible. The nine remaining provisions were set up on the basis of Federal-State cooperation. And this was done in recognition of the fact that the States and their localities have as much responsibility for the common welfare as the Federal Government and can best adapt the program to the particular needs of the people.

That is how the act was deliberately planned, and that is how it is working today. It reserves to the States a very large measure of freedom as to the kind of plans for which they may secure Federal cooperation. And it places upon them the major responsibility for the effective administration of these plans. Thus the act provides specifically that the Federal Social Security Board shall have no jurisdiction over the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of either unemployment compensation or public assistance personnel within the States and their subdivisions. Further, the act is drawn in such a way that the State, rather than the Federal Government, determines who shall be eligible for insurance payments under the one program, and for assistance allowances under the others. Moreover, the Comptroller General has ruled that Federal grants, upon receipt by a State, become State money.

But the fact that a minimum of authority has been concentrated in Washington does not mean that Federal money is disbursed without proper safeguards. The act gives the Federal Government a double check upon State expenditures.

In the first place, the general framework within which all State plans are initially approved and thereafter operate, establishes minimum administrative standards. But to have expected State administrative machinery to function perfectly from the outset would have defeated the whole purpose of the Federal law. A start had to be made at the point where the States were in 1936—and in most States it could not be made without Federal funds. Moreover, these are continuing programs, and in any long pull more will be learned from day-to-day experience on the job than from any amount of advance theorizing. The Federal Government

has therefore taken the position that the cause will be better served by prompt action on its part and genuine cooperation than by strict construction and bureaucratic edict. The States have thus been deliberately assured of ample opportunity for variation in line with local needs, for the experimentation essential to sound evolution, and for growth on the basis of their own experience. Mistakes have, of course, been made in some States, but surveying their progress as a whole, I believe that this policy has been more than justified.

Moreover, in addition to these Nation-wide administrative standards, the Federal Government has a second safeguard. To protect its funds against improper State administration, the Social Security Board is empowered to withhold further payments whenever it finds that administration in a particular State does not conform substantially with any provision of the Federal act. Moreover, when grants to such a State are resumed, the amount of Federal money involved in improper State expenditures is deducted from its future allotments. In these early years such action has properly been taken only in cases of palpable inefficiency. But there can be no question that the Federal Government has both the legal power and the intention of fulfilling the full letter of its responsibility in these matters.

So much for what has been accomplished under the Social Security Act in the brief 26 months of its operation. The record speaks for itself. True, the States and their citizens have a long way to go before they realize the full potential benefits of the present program. But, in spite of the many problems that still confront us, more has been done in the past 2 years to advance the cause of security than in the preceding quarter century; and this fact is all the assurance I want, or any other reasonable man wants, that progress will continue.

It is no reflection on the present law to believe in and to work for its improvement. Indeed, in a long-term program of this nature, it is both natural and necessary to keep an eye on the future, as well as on the present; and I, for one, hope that we shall have free and full debate—both in Congress and out—on all the issues involved in the further development of social security.

Today—and probably for a long time to come—the problem about which people feel the greatest concern is that of old age. For one thing, it is becoming a personal and pressing problem to more people every day; for, while the chances of living to old age are increasing, the odds on remaining self-supporting work the other way. Not only the actual number but the proportion of old people is growing—from 1,000,000 over 65, representing 3 percent of the total population, in 1870, to 8,000,000, representing 6½ percent, today, and on to 16,000,000, or more, representing a full 15 percent, by 1970. Meantime, the number of older men without jobs began to increase as far back as 1890, and there seems no reason to expect the trend of the past half century to be reversed in the next. This problem acutely concerns those who are now old. Over a million and a half of them are dependent on public assistance; many others are undoubtedly now in need; and still others will probably reach the end of their resources before they reach the end of life. But it concerns almost equally those who are now young and middle-aged. They are the old people of the future, and without old-age insurance their prospects would look dark indeed. There is no sense in belittling the seriousness of this problem or quibbling about public responsibility in meeting it. The question at issue is no longer whether our Government shall help its people safeguard old-age security. That was answered by the Supreme Court on May 24, 1937. The only remaining questions are those of method and of sound public economy.

Our present method is to break down the problem and attack it at as many points as possible. Every social measure undertaken by this administration—to ease the impact of unemployment, to promote a sounder agricultural economy, to safeguard savings and homes, to protect the public health, to conserve family life—may properly be said to

better the people's chance of a self-respecting, self-sufficient old age. But this is not enough—not in our high-powered, mass-industry world. Experience has repeatedly proved that for the vast majority there is no longer any assurance that single-handed effort will bring the desired results. Of all the covered workers who have died since the Federal old-age insurance program went into effect last year, over half left not one penny beyond the lump-sum benefit to which their brief participation in this system entitled them.

The Social Security Act undertakes to meet the problem by a twofold method. First, through old-age insurance, which pools the risk on a Nation-wide base, which spreads the cost widely both in time and among the people, which gives its participants the right to an old-age income geared to individual thrift and industry.

But admittedly even this is not enough to meet the immediate problem. There still remains a noninsurable risk. Millions of people are already old and destitute. And even in the future when, as we hope and believe, old-age insurance will be extended to cover practically our entire wage-earning population, some will find themselves without sufficient resources for their declining years. To protect the basic essentials of decency and health for such as these, we have also organized our Federal-State old-age assistance plans, usually referred to as State old-age pensions.

There are, of course, other conceivable methods by which a people may safeguard their old age. The present plan is no more infallible than any other human effort to come to terms with the bitter necessities of life. But in weighing any possible alternative, there are a few questions that we should not fail to consider: Does it square with the twin American ideals of individual thrift and industry, on the one hand, and of social responsibility for the unfortunate, on the other? Does it offer the aged their just share of protection without imposing unjust burdens upon everyone else?

I believe that these questions can be answered with a clear affirmative for the old-age provisions of the Social Security Act. Old-age insurance is based squarely upon individual earnings and employment. What a man gets in old age under this system is his by right of his direct, personal contribution to the national economy. Old-age assistance is based squarely upon the principle of social responsibility for the destitute. What an individual receives under this program is his by virtue of our recognition that needy old age has a claim upon us all.

The cost of this twofold program is high. But the cost of any other course is likely to prove higher still. For example, in its report, the Committee on Economic Security made the following statement:

If an income of only \$25 were to be allowed to all of the people of 65 years and over, the cost would represent a claim upon current national production of \$2,000,000,000 per year. Regardless of what may be done to improve their condition—

The report concludes—

this cost of supporting the aged will continue to increase. In another generation it will be at least double the present total.

Make the assumed payment higher, and by a process of simple arithmetic you will soon find yourself dealing in totals of truly astronomical proportions. The question here is not whether the old folks could make good use of the money, or even whether we would like to be able to guarantee a flat basic income to everyone by virtue of his age and citizenship.

The real questions are: First, by what taxes could we conceivably raise a sum, which might reach twenty to twenty-five billions of dollars annually, for this purpose alone? And, second, even if we could raise the money, would it be fair to give a small minority of the people the lion's share of the Nation's wealth? As to the first question, impartial students of taxation, in Congress and out, are convinced that no tax magic exists whereby an annual yield approximating nearly one-third to one-half of the present total national income can be realized—or anything approaching it. As to the second, no expert testimony is necessary to demonstrate the inequity of giving a small fraction

of our people so disproportionate a share of the Nation's income.

No; the hard-headed American workingman realizes that he has yet to find a better means of protection for his old age. Old-age insurance, which provides for small regular contributions by the worker and his employer spread over the entire productive life of each individual worker, and which bases the amount of benefits on individual earnings, is practical and it is American.

But there are some who, while not openly disputing the old-age insurance principle, still criticize its practice under the present law. Their criticisms are directed against the method of handling social-security funds. Congress has followed the policy of appropriating to the Federal old-age reserve account sums estimated to be about equal to the amounts collected as taxes under title VIII of the Social Security Act, less necessary administrative expenses. Up to the end of February \$575,812,303 had been collected in such taxes and \$595,100,000 had already been invested in 3-percent special Treasury notes. That is, the investment in the reserve account was by that date some \$20,000,000 more than the total tax collections under title VIII. There can, therefore, be no question that these operations have followed both the letter and the spirit of the law in every respect.

It appears, however, that compliance with the law is not enough for these critics. They do not like the law itself. They are concerned because it directs the Treasury to invest these funds in United States Government obligations. And they seem to feel that the money would be what they call safer if the Treasury hid the currency under the mattress or buried it in an old iron pot. If this strange idea were actually followed, there might then be some point in the contention that social-security taxes take money out of circulation.

Any question of the practice of investing these funds in United States Government obligations demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of principles which are as basic in private as in public finance. It assumes that such investment is a useless, uneconomic legal fiction which would be frowned upon by private business. Actually, of course, this procedure is precisely that which every sound private financial institution follows. And the fact that this investment leads to the legitimate use of these funds by the Government is exactly like the legitimate use by a savings bank of the funds deposited with it.

To call the Government obligations in the reserve account mere I O U's or paper promises is utterly unfair and misleading. The same thing could be said about every bank deposit, every insurance policy, every security investment in existence. Yet the people who cry "wolf" loudest about the old-age reserve account are the very ones who profess the greatest confidence in the investment policies of private business.

Morever, if investment in Government obligations is as unsound as critics of the old-age reserve contend, it is hard to see why banks, insurance companies, and other large corporations all put much of their reserves in United States Treasury bonds. For if the obligations held by the old-age reserve fund are scraps of paper, then by the same token the Government investments purchased by these private businesses are worthless. Actually, of course, conservative private institutions put their creditors' money into Government obligations because they know it is the safest investment they can possibly make. And current practice with regard to the reserve simply follows their precedent.

Perhaps this mare's-nest of misunderstanding would not have been stirred up if there were not a current deficit in the present Government Budget. But since the appropriations to the old-age reserve account have been greater than the actual tax collections under title VIII of the Social Security Act, there are no grounds whatsoever for implying that these taxes have been used to disguise or conceal the deficit. It is true, of course, that if the Social Security Act had not been in operation, the Government would have been

obliged to sell more bonds on the open market; and that, instead of doing so, it has now issued obligations to the credit of the old-age reserve account. But the only effect of this procedure is to make the millions of workers with social-security accounts the holders of Government obligations which would otherwise have been bought up eagerly by insurance companies, savings banks, and other large investors.

I shall not attempt at this time to discuss further the fundamentals of old-age security. Admittedly there are other conceivable methods of financing it, each with its particular advantages and disadvantages. These pros and cons can be weighed only as they affect the total program. But regardless of method, the basic issue is the integrity and intelligence of our Government. For when all is said and done, if the United States Government is not safe, then no form of social security is safe.

There is just one final point about the present old-age insurance program that I want to emphasize. And this is the fact that it is fair and equitable to the worker and to the general taxpayer. Every covered worker gets back his contribution with an allowance for interest. And the majority, in their monthly payments, will get back a great deal more. Specifically, every worker—regardless of his wage or length of service—is assured of a larger monthly retirement payment than he could buy from any private insurance company with an amount equal to what he himself has contributed to this plan.

From time to time there seems to have been an attempt in some quarters to convince the wage earner that he is paying more for this protection than it is worth. That attempt has not succeeded. It has not succeeded because the plain facts are self-evident. There have been other unsuccessful attempts to discredit the old-age insurance system.

First, we were told that getting workers to apply for social-security account numbers was an impossible task. That impossible task was undertaken jointly by the Social Security Board and the Post Office Department, and to date over 38,000,000 workers have had accounts set up for them.

Later, we were told that workers might do their part, but that employers would not, and that the Government could not do theirs—that employers would not make the report required by law; and that, even if they did, no Government agency was capable of keeping these millions of individual, cumulative wage records. Well, employers have been reporting for nearly a year. And the Baltimore operations office of the Social Security Board not only has all its millions of records set up, but is already posting wage reports to the accounts of workers in every State.

Finally, we were told that the whole idea was unconstitutional. The voice of the opposition has not been stilled even by the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the full intent and method of this law. But since May of last year it has become less strident. By now the American people have taken the measure of the social-security opposition. They know that these contentions are but straw men—trumped up by those who for diverse reasons are unwilling to see the social-security program succeed. One after another in the brief history of social security in America we have seen them fall—the straw man of noncompliance; the straw man of inefficiency; the straw man of unconstitutionality; and the straw man of mishandling the worker's money.

No doubt other straw men will be reared in future. But they also will fall. They will fall because the accomplishments of the social-security program constitute a complete refutation. This Congress has a right to be proud of its handiwork. Again I urge that you refer to the complete record of my remarks which shows the accomplishments State by State so that each one of you may see for yourself the great benefits which your State has derived.

The American people will not be easily persuaded that a program which, in spite of obstacles and opposition, has stood and is standing the test of actual operation is theoretically unsound. This is not to say that the Social Security

Act is perfect or that it will never need to be amended. In its early days before Congress, on April 11, 1935, I said in this House—

We do not claim it to be a perfect measure nor one that will not require amendment from time to time in the light of experience.

And I repeat the same today. But in repeating it, I lay all the emphasis at my command on the last five words. It is in the light of experience that the Social Security Act must be—and will be—developed from this point on.

Thomas Jefferson once declared that "A year of experience in government is worth a century of book reading." We have now had more than 2 years' experience in Government social-security activity—2 years which are worth two centuries of impractical theorizing and wishful thinking. Social security will go forward in the United States. There is absolutely no doubt of that. But its progress will be enduring only as it is in line with our experience and with our financial capacity.

Those of us who have devoted the best part of our lives to the service of this country have no illusions that we or any Congress which succeeds us can legislate for Utopia. But we are fully aware of our obligation to see that Federal legislation keeps pace with the Nation's needs. In the words of Mr. Justice Cardozo:

Congress did not improvise a judgment when it found that the award of old-age benefits would be conducive to the general welfare. * * * Nor is the concept of the general welfare static. * * * What is critical or urgent changes with the times and cannot be known through a formula in advance of the event.

This great opinion goes on in unequivocal terms to state that in determining the scope and method of social legislation discretion is lodged with Congress—not with the courts or any other body but with the Members of this House and their colleagues across the Capitol. I have no doubt that Congress will continue to discharge this paramount obligation with the practical wisdom and the farseeing vision which has marked its course in the past, and especially during the last 3 years.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the Farmers Equity Union is one of the best and strongest farm organizations in the Northwest. It is an educational organization, and also through its activities there have been numerous cooperative enterprises organized which have been of great material benefit to the farmers.

The members of the Farmers Equity Union have a live interest in all public questions. At a county convention of the Farmers Equity Union recently held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., the following resolutions regarding matters of great moment to the farmers were adopted. I would like to have these resolutions extended in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the ever-increasing imports of agricultural products under the reciprocal-trade agreements are having a disastrous effect upon American agriculture; and

Whereas the benefits of past and present farm-benefit programs are being far outweighed by these ever-increasing imports produced by cheap foreign labor; and

Whereas the exports of industrial products have increased, at the expense of increased agricultural imports: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the delegates of the Chippewa County Farmers Equity Union, Wisconsin Division, in convention assembled this 26th day of March 1938, request our State board of directors and the Northwest legislative committee to use all possible influence to have these unfair practices stopped; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be printed in the Farmers Equity Union News and the Farmers Union Herald, and that copies be sent to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Hon. Henry A. Wallace, all Wisconsin Senators and Representatives, with a special request that Hon. MERLIN HULL insert same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CHIPPEWA COUNTY FARMERS EQUITY UNION,
JOHN MELVILLE, Secretary.

Whereas the citizens of this country are being sold into overwhelming indebtedness by the method of selling tax-free interest-bearing Government bonds to the private money lenders of the country for all Government appropriations over and above the amount raised by taxation: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we let our legislative committee and Congressmen and Senators be informed of the fact that we demand that the power to coin and regulate money be returned to Congress where it belongs.

CHIPPEWA COUNTY FARMERS EQUITY UNION,
JOHN MELVILLE, Secretary.

Whereas the war problem is becoming more and more serious and may mean giving up our young men to protect home capital in foreign lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the delegates of the Chippewa County Farmers Equity Union, in convention assembled this 26th day of March 1938, as opposed to sending any help to fight foreign wars.

CHIPPEWA COUNTY FARMERS EQUITY UNION,
JOHN MELVILLE, Secretary.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has submitted to Congress a proposal for enormous spending of public funds, as follows: An additional \$1,250,000,000 for W. P. A., and other items totaling \$2,062,000,000, and loans of one kind or another, which the Treasury would not expect to be paid back in full, totaling \$1,450,000,000, a total additional program of spending amounting to \$3,450,000,000, on top of \$1,500,000,000 lending program and enormous highways, public buildings, and departmental expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, up to the enormous total of \$12,500,000,000.

The other analyses which have been submitted are short \$1,000,000,000 because the figures submitted only cover the carrying of W. P. A. for the period to February 1, 1939, and we must add \$1,000,000,000 for that to any figures which have previously been submitted.

With the customs receipts for this month running about 50 percent of last year and the certainty that individual and corporate incomes will be sharply curtailed for the 1938 calendar year, we cannot expect governmental revenues to run more than \$4,500,000,000 as a result of the Roosevelt depression. And a good part of what income the Government will receive will come from taxes on pay rolls and the pay envelopes of those who work in the factories and shops and on the railroads. This means a Federal deficit in that period of approximately \$8,000,000,000.

With the release of gold from the general fund of the Treasury there has already been an addition of gold certificates outstanding in the sum of \$1,400,000,000. Reports of the Treasury's purchase of paper for the printing of currency raises the prospect that the administration is preparing to issue the entire \$3,000,000,000 of greenbacks authorized by the vicious Thomas inflation amendment. This will wipe out the entire cushion of \$4,400,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes in circulation and unquestionably will result in inflation. That means a destruction of the Government's credit, a reduction in the price of Government bonds, a lowering of the purchasing power of the wage of the workingman, and the complete stagnation of industry. Everyone will have to pay more for everything they buy and because of the vicious tax bill, the vicious Labor Board, and the irresponsible method of handling Government business, the opportunity for private employment will be gone. Because of these things, inflation cannot have the effect it had in 1933 and 1934, of stimulating business, but it will just create more and more distress.

We are approaching a new low point in industrial and private employment, due almost entirely to the President's foolish legislation and his failure entirely to grasp the economic principles upon which the prosperity of the country and employment by private industry can be brought about.

He has promised social security. He has promised that the one-third of the population which, in his opinion, was ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed, should be given an opportunity to live like the other two-thirds of the population. Yet he complains about overproduction. The two simply do not go together.

What actually happened? The actual result is that farm incomes have dropped off because of the tremendous drop in

prices of farm products. The employment of our people has dropped—and dropped off much more rapidly than ever before—because of the tremendous taxes which the President has imposed upon the people and the fear he has generated throughout the land.

I know of one small employer of labor who has been forced because of the unemployment-insurance taxes that he has had to pay to lay off for the period from May 1 to November 1 from two to three employees whom he formerly has been keeping on all through the dull summer months. The unemployment-insurance taxes alone which he has had to pay upon his workers are much more than the saving which he will make by laying off these men. In other words, the employer, to avoid bankruptcy, has had to throw entirely out of work a group of people who are bound to be on relief most of the time—a group of people he would be able, and would like, to keep employed if his financial resources permitted.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. As long as the gentleman is speaking on the relief issue I wonder if the gentleman read in the paper this morning the statement by one of the anonymous secretaries of the President, his son James, that he is going to cure all the economic evils, and his cure will be received with some surprise and suspense by the people of the country. He states the only thing to do is to put more men on relief and spend more money, and it will be easier to balance the Budget.

Mr. TABER. Of course, if the object of the administration is to put more people on relief and to have more people on relief, it will have accomplished that object, but what that has to do with balancing the Budget I do not just see. It probably is true that the only thing the administration likes is to put people on relief.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not believe that statement is quite accurate. I have noticed the tendency on the part of the New Dealers is to use the Marine Corps for relieving unemployment.

Mr. TABER. They have used that to a certain extent, in just a family way.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman believe it has been used to its fullest possibilities?

Mr. TABER. Probably not. I presume we will hear of a lot more just such operations later on.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I suggest to the gentleman that when the New Dealers ask for more appropriations before the gentleman's committee that the gentleman suggest this new outlet that has been recently discovered.

Mr. TABER. That might solve the problem.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Not facetiously, but in earnest, may I ask if the gentleman intends before he finishes his remarks to tell us just how this relief measure will come before us? If the gentleman has time, I wish he would take the time to tell us that. I see in the papers what they propose to do, but since the gentleman is such an outstanding member of the Committee on Appropriations, I should like to ask if he knows how the bill will come before us, and if he knows, will he tell us?

Mr. TABER. The minority members have not yet been consulted on how it is proposed to bring out the bill. I presume they will study the question of the kind of dose in which they can get the House to take the bill. If the House can take a big dose they will probably give it all to the House at once, just in order to get the thing through. They do not care anything at all about its merits.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The chances are, then, they will throw some popular proposals in with the unpopular ones in the hope they will get the unpopular features passed?

Mr. TABER. That is about the size of it.

The Farm Security Administration and the P. W. A., at a gigantic cost but with comparatively few projects completed, have undertaken to build structures to house certain groups of people in the low-income brackets. With the poor architectural work which has generally been the result, the projects have almost always been a failure and have not accomplished very much in the line of providing better housing. Nothing has been contributed to a long-range solution of our housing problem. Even now the Farm Security Administration and the P. W. A. have people snooping around trying to build these enormous lay-outs where they are not needed and where they are a menace to privately owned and privately operated houses of good quality.

We have the National Labor Relations Act, and the Board that has been established under it has spent its time stirring up and agitating labor trouble and supporting one particular union—the C. I. O.—as against all other unions and organizations of employees. Only last Saturday, when an A. F. of L. union won a vote in a plant in Carrollton, Ohio, the Labor Board set aside the election because the C. I. O. did not win. Without the reconstruction of this Labor Board along lines of sanity and common sense and fairness, there is absolutely no opportunity for the employers of this country to provide suitable and adequate employment for our people. Conditions are promoted by the Labor Board which make it absolutely impossible for the employer to operate at a profit, and do not result in any benefit to the worker, because in the end he will be deprived of his job through the closing down of the factory. No one objects to an honest, fair Labor Board; but such a Board must be fair and must aim to be fair between employer and employee and between different unions or organizations of employees and between employees who are not organized at all and those who are organized.

Pump priming, which has for 5 years proved a failure, is now demanded again by the Chief Executive. What does this program contemplate?

It will continue W. P. A., the most incompetent form of relief, down to February 1, 1939, on about the same basis that they are running now. It will establish a billion dollars in the hands of the P. W. A. under the direction of the intolerant Harold Ickes, to make grants and loans for the construction of local buildings and projects which the local communities cannot afford themselves. Entirely overlooked is the huge tax burden this program will place on the local communities in the future as a result of the cost of maintaining and servicing these projects when completed.

No employment can possibly result from any of these activities in less than 6 months, and no substantial employment in less than 9 or 10 months. Already now, with the funds appropriated last year after the P. W. A. had announced to people steadily for over 6 months that it had no more funds available for grants or loans, it has begun to make grants and loans throughout the United States, right on the eve of taking up this fake relief bill. Of course, the purpose is to influence Members of the House and Senate to support this racketeering program.

It adds \$300,000,000 to the amount to be loaned by the United States Housing Authority to local communities which cannot result in construction in less than 6 months.

Why, the United States Housing Authority has spent more than 7 months trying to organize itself and although it has had \$100,000,000 available since September 1 last, it has yet to commence actual construction of a single project.

The loans by the R. F. C. to small business are not half as effective as local loans by banks, and very few such loans will be made, because the small industries and small businesses cannot provide the security which the R. F. C. will require. But over and beyond that, there can be no effect from the program in the line of putting people to work in private business because of the tremendous taxes which have been placed on business and the operations of the National Labor Relations Board and the constant, overhanging threat of dangerous inflation. So many people have been forced out of business because of the reactionary measures which

have been adopted, because of the operations of the Government in losing our export market for agricultural products and destroying the opportunity for private employment, that nothing short of an intelligent, constructive program can produce any results at this time.

I propose as a recovery program:

First. Amendment of the National Labor Relations Act along lines that will promote harmony instead of discord between employee groups and employers. Inasmuch as that cannot be done without a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress—because Mr. Roosevelt would veto such a bill—I suggest the adoption of a concurrent resolution wiping out all appropriations for this Board after July 1, 1938, as a change in the Independent Offices Act, which is now in disagreement between the two Houses of Congress. Later on, honest legislation, providing for a fair labor board, with fair duties and powers, can be provided, after the destructive Labor Board which is now such a menace to the country is wiped out.

Second. Passage of the tax bill now in disagreement between the House and Senate, with the provisions of the Senate relating to the capital-gains tax and the undistributed-profits tax inserted, and some fair rate of taxation upon corporation earnings, so that people will have some security in going into business and creating employment for our idle workers.

Third. Repeal of the dangerous "greenback law," which provides for inflation.

Fourth. I would suggest an attempt to recover our export market for agricultural products by giving opportunity for the export of cotton, wheat, pork, and beef, along constructive lines for the purpose of getting rid of our surplus instead of trying to curtail our production.

Fifth. I suggest that the relief problem be returned to the localities to handle, with a required contribution of at least 25 percent on the part of the localities under provisions where the localities will have an opportunity to say what they want to do and how they want to do it to meet their own problems. Get rid of the W. P. A. and P. W. A., the Housing Authority, the Farm Security Administration, and all of the other rackets which have done so much to prevent the employment of our people and have proved so costly.

Sixth. Appropriate only what is needed, without fangles. This will permit us to balance the Federal Budget, restore confidence, and put our people to work in private industry.

We have found from sad experience in the last 5 years that the social security of our people—except New Deal jobholders—has not been promoted by the expenditure of approximately \$16,000,000,000 on boondoggling, relief programs, and similar activities. Now we know that when we are all through we are just that much worse off. Let us turn away from the path of proven failure and attempt to solve our problems by giving industry an opportunity to put its people to work by promoting, rather than curtailing, the opportunity for the employment of our people in private enterprise.

I hope that the membership of this House will approach this problem with the idea of advancing their country's interest, and maintaining the freedom of our people and giving them an opportunity to establish themselves and their families on solid ground instead of shifting sands. Let us stand firm against making more acute the depression by the appropriation of fabulous sums for the purpose of gratifying the spite and the spleen of the Chief Executive and promoting his plan to defeat those who have had the courage to oppose him. Some of my Democratic friends may, too late, awake to the fact that instead of priming the pump, the Chief Executive proposes to pump the primaries.

Instead of continuing the destructive proposals of the President let us turn our eyes toward a constructive program which will rejuvenate business and industry, give our people a chance to work, and bring about a lasting economic recovery. Let us meet our responsibility to the people and stop playing politics with relief.

The adoption of what I have proposed would get rid of the fear that depresses all our people, of high and low degree—a fear which now paralyzes business and trading and

has brought about in many substantial industries the lowest rate of employment in the history of the country. The program that I have suggested will start the wheels of progress, give employment to our people, provide a market for our agricultural, manufacturing, and mining industries.

We have never had a surplus of production in this country. We have had, many times, a shortage in consumption because the people did not have the money with which to buy. Demand for goods, the employment of our people, and a proper restoration of the export market will solve our problems. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The letters I am receiving seem to indicate the idea is prevalent among the people of the country that one of the purposes of this new spending urge is to make the country safe for the New Dealers. Does the gentleman believe there is any foundation for that belief?

Mr. TABER. I believe that is the primary object of the program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this being the only committee of which I am the ranking member, I believe it would be amiss if I did not speak on this occasion.

We are now considering a bill that provides work for people, and generally, I may say to the members of the Committee, I believe this is a well-considered bill in that direction. I am going to support this bill as it comes from the committee.

At this particular moment we are faced with the fact that approximately 13,500,000 people are out of jobs in this country. They want jobs but cannot get them. I do not have any too much sympathy for those who say private business will employ all these millions if it is left alone, because the fact has been presented to this Congress on more than one occasion that if business had its own way it would be unable to employ more than 3,000,000 of those who are out of jobs. If that is true—and if it is not true somebody ought to dispute it, either in the committee or on the floor of the House—what are we going to do with the other millions who are out of employment?

As I see the situation, regardless of any political consequences in any direction, a new duty has devolved upon this Nation and upon this Congress, and this is to provide work when private enterprise has so dismally failed to take up the slack. Consequently, any bill that comes before this Congress with a well-thought-out program of work is going to have my support.

Those who say our monetary system would correct the evils if we would extend credit do not really understand what there is to the subject of the monetary policy of this country. To extend credit—that on its face condemns the program. You cannot extend credit to anyone under our present system of finance unless that person has something to offer as security. We have 65,000,000 people in this country who can offer no security, and although they have the greatest assets in the world, muscular power and brain power, really the latent capital of the entire country, they cannot get credit. Therefore, if you put through a program to extend credit in this country you are making the situation worse because you give the credit to the top. The only people who can get credit are those who have accumulated some property. Our job is to take care of the 65,000,000 people who are at the bottom of the heap and cannot participate in a program of recovery under a plan of lending money. We must put this money in the hands of the people at the bottom, who will spend it. You can pick out any number of plans in this Congress that are headed in that direction.

Let me say to you that as little as I know about legislation and as little as the experience I have had has been, it was only about a year ago I had the temerity to suggest to this House that if the Federal Reserve Board put through its program of raising the reserve requirements we would have

another panic. This statement was made on the floor of the House not only by myself but by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BUCKLER] in a speech calling attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve Board had raised the requirements 100 percent. Since that day you have seen the prediction that was made by the gentleman from Minnesota come true.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman know that at the time they raised the requirements and after they raised them there was still in excess of \$1,000,000,000 of excess reserves that could be drawn on?

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know what the figures show, but I do know that if you require the banking system of the country to keep on hand a 100-percent increase in reserves, that automatically shuts off the power to lend that money.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman know there is a school of philosophy in this country that wants all bank reserves to be at 100 percent?

Mr. BURDICK. I understand that is true, yes, and there is a bill before this very Congress embodying that principle.

Mr. FORD of California. And the gentleman states that the raising of these requirements by the Federal Reserve Board was the occasion for this depression?

Mr. BURDICK. That was the immediate cause.

Mr. FORD of California. That would have been true if there has not been in excess of \$1,000,000,000 of excess reserve after the lowering of requirements, and a funny thing about this so-called depression is that there has not been a single bank "busted" during the period of the depression. Has the gentleman ever thought of that?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes, I have thought of it, and it is not true. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORD of California. It is true. Name the bank.

Mr. BURDICK. Twenty-two of them in the Northwest. And without the United States guaranty of deposits half of them would be in serious difficulty.

Mr. FORD of California. There have not been 1,060 of them in a week.

Mr. BURDICK. North Dakota has contributed its share, and the Comptroller of the Currency will give you a list of banks which are either closed or ordered to be closed since December 1937.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. I agree with what the gentleman from North Dakota is saying, and just about a year ago I remember on this floor when the gentleman who is now speaking called the attention of the Congress to the acts of the Federal Reserve banks, and I also made a speech on the floor here calling attention to what would happen when the Federal Reserve banks raised the reserves of these banks, stating that we were headed for another panic. Very few people in this Congress paid any attention, I am sure, to what I said, but the statement is in the RECORD. I made the statement we were headed for another panic. No one thought then we were headed for another panic, but we went into another one, and we will go into another panic whenever we take credit out of circulation in the country. I am glad the gentleman from North Dakota is bringing this to our attention because that caused the panic, and nothing else, and the only way you can get out of this panic is to put some extra money in circulation, as the President is proposing to do at this time. They have recognized the fact that this did cause the panic, because the Federal Reserve bank has taken down the reserves to a certain extent, but I claim they have not reduced them enough yet.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his contribution. I agree with him that no-

body paid any attention either to the gentleman or to myself at that time, and I doubt if they are going to do so now.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. I agree with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURDICK. I want now to give you some concrete facts with reference to the situation in the area from which I come. Between the years 1930 and 1935, due entirely to our financial policy, not chargeable to the Democrats but chargeable to every party that has had control of it since 1860, and due to the drought, there has been a decrease of 399,000 acres of the area harvested between the years 1930 and 1935.

Sixty-five percent of all the farmers in the area cannot pay their taxes. There has been a decrease of 50 percent in all livestock in the area between 1930 and 1936.

Of a total population in this area surrounding the Public Works program, which I am going to present to you, of 19,000 people, 15,000 of them have been on relief, and I presume are there yet.

Now, through the program proposed by this Congress to plan work, which evidently private business cannot do, an area along the Missouri River can be irrigated at a cost of \$62 per acre. The greater portion of the people living in that section of the country will not only get off of relief but they will furnish food for the entire country, provided this Congress plans ahead and makes arrangements by which these people can help themselves.

I am only sorry that under the rules and regulations of this House an appropriation for this venture cannot be presented in the present bill, but it will be presented when the last deficiency appropriation bill comes before this Congress. Let me tell you the difference between irrigated land in the arid West and land across the road that is not irrigated. There is a difference of \$18 an acre income, so if we amortize the money this Government puts in on a period of 40 years, during those 40 years a farmer would have to pay only \$3.72 per acre for the use of this water, and at the same time he will extinguish the debt, and you are not giving us anything. You are just giving us a chance to help ourselves, and not only get off relief, but to get everybody else off relief. I understand what some of the eastern Members think. They think that if we cannot live out there in the West, we ought to move out. We are not moving out, however. We went there over half a century ago, and we built our institutions and reared our children there, and we have our churches and schools and railroads and roads there, and for 50 years we have never asked help from anyone, and we are not moving out. We are asking this Congress to give us a chance to help ourselves, and whenever a bill of this character comes before the Congress, it is a planned-work program. We must do something in this country to put these millions to work, and any time the Congress or the President or a committee will come before this House with a program that is sound and lasting and will help the people, we are going to be the kind of Representatives from my section of the country that will not raise any protest against any plan of the President or of Congress to put the program into execution.

Gentlemen will remember that a year ago in this Congress when we were making appropriations for relief, I submitted an amendment on the floor of the House to raise the \$1,500,000,000 figure to \$4,000,000,000, and how the Members of this Congress laughed. One of them asked me whether I had offered the amendment in order to get a chance to talk for 5 minutes. I said "no"; that I had offered it because I believed it to be warranted, I did not believe that a billion dollars would do the job. Now, several months later, everybody is convinced—I will not say everyone, but a great many Members of this Congress are convinced that the President is not asking for too much at all. A governmental duty falls upon this Congress. Are we going to sit here and let 13,000,000 people go without employment if we can give them employment? Are you going to let your party or your faction stand in the road of giving us relief? I do not think the Congress is made up of that kind of men. We are going to stay here until we do the job. The people

do not care who is in control of this Congress, whether Democrats or Republicans. What they want is somebody to represent them and meet the facts, as we find them to be, and that is my position. As I said before I am opposed by Republicans in my State. I have to fight them before I can get on the ticket, and after I get that job done, if I ever do, I have to oppose the Democrats. They are hungry for a job, too. We have not got enough Democrats in the State hardly to fill the post offices, but there seems to be an awful lot of them at election time, because those that are defeated in the primaries on the Republican ticket turn and go with the Democrats in the fall election. So I have not any chance of coming back here to this Congress anyway. I never had a chance of getting here in the first place. I never had anybody with me in North Dakota except the voters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that enough? That is all any of us want.

Mr. BURDICK. So while I am here, I want to represent those people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not asking any more for his people than has been given in the East, is he?

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, I never have objected to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman is not asking any more.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, no, the gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. I will finish this speech by extending my remarks, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] for giving me this time. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. RICH.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are considering the war appropriation bill for nonmilitary items, asking for \$197,000,000 plus. Let us see what the House of Representatives has spent for war appropriations. The Navy appropriation bill amounts to \$553,000,000. The Navy emergency appropriation bill amounts to \$1,200,000,000. The war appropriation bill carries \$448,000,000, and that makes a total of over \$2,200,000,000 appropriated in preparation of war. We come in now for nonmilitary items and we ask for the sum of \$197,000,000. It seems to me that this Administration is war-minded, notwithstanding the fact that last year we passed the Neutrality Act to keep us out of war with any foreign nation. When you spend \$2,200,000,000 in preparation for war you have spent a tremendous sum, all the while the neutrality act lies dormant in the President's desk, and it seems to me almost incredible that a man who asked for the neutrality act would not use it when he has the power to do so, but permits war materials to be shipped on to Japan, in order that innocent women and children may be killed by munitions manufactured in this country. It is unjust, inhuman, and unworthy a nation like ours to assist in the persecution and execution of innocent people, for the sum of a few paltry dollars. Why does not the President prohibit the exportation of war materials to Japan?

It is deplorable to think of; but now I am interested in another war, the war on depression in our own country. Let us see what the President of the United States said when he was running for office in 1932. He was elected on the plan and policy of economy in government. The people hailed him as a great man coming into office. Has he carried out his promises to the American people? Let us see what he said when he addressed a joint session of the Congress March 10, 1933—

For 3 long years, the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

With the utmost seriousness, I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact (the accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000) on our national economy.

It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure.

It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people.

It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.

They were wise words by the President of the United States; but just think what the President of the United States has been doing in the last 5 years. Oh! how he has changed. It ought to make you shudder; it ought to make every Member of Congress pause and wonder to think that he has spent more than \$19,000,000,000 above what the Government has received. We keep going into the red. At the present time, for this year as of April 18, we had a deficit of \$1,152,297,851, notwithstanding the fact that the President promised many times a balanced Budget for this year. Before this year has finished on the 30th of June you are going to be close to \$1,500,000,000 in the red, or probably more. A horrible thought. Next year, 1939, according to the President's program, I predict more than a two billion deficit.

What is this all about? I would like to make more quotations of what the President talked about in 1932, quotations very similar to the one I just read. And to think that Members of Congress have been engaged in assisting him in his change to this ruthless expenditure of Government funds under the guise of relief. All are agreed that we should take care of the people of this country.

No one ever starved before, no one should or would starve; but you have set up under the guise of W. P. A., under the guise of relief, the greatest boondoggling political bureaucratic machine the world has ever seen; and that in this Nation of ours. It makes my blood run hot and cold in the same minute to think how the Members of Congress have been responsible for encouraging this kind of ruthless bureaucratic spending under the guise of relief and sound methods of pump priming. Oh, what a headache it is to the country.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield now. I will yield in a few minutes, if I have time.

Did you read Son Jimmy's address out at Middletown, Ohio, yesterday? Young Jimmy, the Crown Prince, said that if the increase of national income resulting from the first pump priming had kept up, the Budget would have been balanced in 1938. That big word "if," "if," "if." Well, James, it requires a man of sound business experience to do the job. Not a man who never did or could meet a pay roll or run a successful business.

Your father tried pump priming to the tune of \$19,000,000,000. Where are you now? As against 11,000,000 men out of work in 1933 you now have 13,500,000 out of work; you have industry practically wrecked; you have the people of this country in a condition where the businessmen are thinking more of trying to preserve what little they have left rather than venture it in new business activities. They are all afraid of your papa; both big- and small-business men are worried. It is a deplorable condition in which we find ourselves. And whose fault is it? I say the President's fault in trying all the new things any new dealer suggests, rather than the advice of sound Jeffersonian Democrats with experience.

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. FORD of California rose.

Mr. RICH. I will yield in a few minutes, if I have the time. I want to give you a few more examples of your boondoggling, bad, unethical, prejudicial, unsound legislation. You must change the attitude of the people of this country to sound fundamentals of business. You are not going to do it by permitting John L. Lewis, the radical labor leader, to succeed in his efforts to domineer this country. When John L. Lewis says a law cannot be passed, the Members of Congress get in goosestep with John L. Lewis and

ask him whether they dare pass a law here in Congress. If he says yes, you pass the law. If he says no, then you defeat it. Why do not the Members of Congress act for the best interest of America rather than do what some radical personage insists on your doing to meet his own personal views. It is not sensible, it is not good for the country or for labor, nor for you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman's temperature lowers I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes, while my temperature is high, because the Congress needs some sound advice.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. I have only 3 minutes. If the gentleman will get me 3 minutes more I will yield. I am sorry.

What are you trying to do? You are trying to create a scarcity of farm produce. You are trying to create a scarcity in all commodities of life that the people of this country need. At the same time you say you are going to raise the American standard of living, but how are you going to do it? You are trying to raise the American standard of living through these reciprocal-trade agreements, by permitting importations to come into this country produced by foreign countries, produced by peon and peasant labor, grown by men who are paid one-tenth the sum our farmers receive. You are permitting manufactured articles to come into this country that are manufactured in foreign countries by people who receive from one-fifth to one-tenth the salaries that American labor receives.

How are you going to help American farmers and labor if you permit that? It cannot be done. Just look at the amount of farm produce that is coming into this country. It is astounding, it is astonishing what great amount of imports that replace American labor, and you men on this side of the aisle ought to take these powers away from the President of the United States at once. Do your own legislating, do your own thinking, give the American markets to the American people if you want prosperity. You want to give men work in industry and on the farm; work means happiness and home. Are you going to permit the National Labor Relations Board and the Wagner Act to continue to give advantages to labor without the responsibility that should go with it? That is one thing this Congress should clear up before it adjourns. It should enact legislation which will give to labor and the manufacturer the same or equal rights. You cannot smother the manufacturers and compel them to close down through these unlawful, unethical sit-down strikes and expect laboring men to have jobs. The men who are interested in labor ought to be interested in holding labor responsible for their acts and deeds just as the men who employ labor should be responsible for their acts and deeds. Labor and capital are inseparable and we ought to make laws to keep them so. I do hope that the President and Congress will consider carefully just and equitable revision of the Wagner Act and other laws recently passed; give the capitalistic system a chance to function and it will do its part in getting us out of the dreadful condition in which we find ourselves. It will put men to work, the Government cannot do it. In 150 years it made this country the land of opportunity, the land of liberty, and the land of freedom. The greatest country on the face of the earth. Let us do our duty to perpetuate it. Do not wreck it with untried, improper, and unsound ideas. Let us be practical. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in asking for time on this particular occasion is to make the announcement that I have arranged for hearings before the Appropriations Committee some time next week for the purpose of trying to earmark \$120,000,000 of the funds mentioned by the President in his message for public works.

The President has asked for \$450,000,000 for the purpose of Public Works Administration.

In connection with the United States Army, in every State and in many places in the various States worse housing conditions exist than exist in the worst slums in the cities of this country. I have here a list which I shall ask permission to include with my remarks when we go back into the House covering 181 different projects in Army posts where it is proposed to allocate this money. The total will be approximately \$120,000,000. All the items for each particular post is set out in this list which I will later place in the Record for the purpose of giving the membership of the House an opportunity to look it over. I hope that every Member will examine it with care.

The idea I have in mind is, if the committee does not report in that bill an earmarking of this money in the title relating to public works, I shall undertake to do so on the floor of the House by an amendment to the bill. I will want a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives with me when I undertake to do that.

I may say further that I have not had the opportunity to confer with the President about this matter, but the War Department has taken it up with the Public Works Administrator with a view to getting his approval. It may not be necessary for me to offer an amendment, but if it is I shall do so. I think it a wise step to take because we will ultimately have to do it. Why should the Congress allow our Army personnel to be housed with their families in miserable hovels, while the P. W. A. spends hundreds of millions of dollars to build new and modern housing plants in the great cities for occupation in thousands of cases by people who have never been declared their allegiance to this country, for whose flag our Army troops are ready and willing to fight and even die if need be? Why leave them ill-housed and their families required to live in mere shacks unfit in many instances for human habitation? At this point in the Record I include a table of 181 needy projects listed in the War Department records:

War Department construction priority list, Apr. 15, 1938

[Arranged to show items authorized by Congress and items not yet authorized]

No.	Authorized act, 394, Aug. 26, 1937	Public, 263, Aug. 12, 1935, Wilcox	Not authorized	Place	Cost
1			No.	Fort Lewis.....	\$2,680,240
2	(*)			Fort Clayton, Canal Zone.....	680,500
3	(*)			Fort Davis, Canal Zone.....	553,000
4		W		Hickam Field, Territory of Hawaii.....	3,721,978
5		W		Wheeler Field, Territory of Hawaii.....	940,000
6		W		Albrook Field, Canal Zone.....	2,254,400
7	(*)			Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone.....	90,000
8	(*)		No.	Fort Shafter, Territory of Hawaii.....	\$827,500
				{ wall.....	987,000
					1,814,500
9	(*)		No.	Schofield Barracks, Territory of Hawaii.....	\$1,264,200
				{ tory of Hawaii.....	2,850,400
					4,114,600
10	(*)			Fort Bragg, N. C.....	413,500
11	(*)			Fort Riley, Kans.....	405,000
12	(*)			Fort Monroe, Va.....	335,000
13	(*)		No.	Fort Humphreys, D. C.....	\$78,380
				{ 66,500	144,880
14			No.	Fort Knox, Ky.....	2,899,200
15		W		Hickam Field, Territory of Hawaii.....	3,829,000
16		W		Wheeler Field, Territory of Hawaii.....	1,012,000
17	(*)			Fort Crook, Nebr.....	193,000
18	(*)			Headquarters Provisional Brigade, Washington Quartermaster Depot.....	1,893,188
19	(*)			Corozal general depot, Canal Zone.....	459,300
20	(*)		No.	Carlisle Barracks, Pa.....	\$239,500
				{ 655,300	894,800
21	(*)			Fort Monmouth, N. J.....	377,500
22	(*)			Fort Shafter, Territory of Hawaii.....	246,500

War Department construction priority list, Apr. 15, 1938—Continued

No.	Author- ized act, 394, Aug. 26, 1937	Public, 263, Aug. 12, 1935, Wilcox	Not au- thor- ized	Place	Cost
23	(*)			Madison Barracks, N. Y.	\$359,500
24	(*)			Fort DuPont, Del.	413,500
25		W		Albrook Field, Canal Zone	330,000
26	Special			Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.	1,023,413
27		W		Chanute Field, Ill.	1,412,622
28			No.	Army Medical Center, D. C.	541,500
29	(*)			Fort Bliss, Tex.	463,000
30	(*)			Fort Washington, Md.	30,000
31	(*)			Fort MacArthur, Calif.	138,500
32	(*)			Fort Myer, Va.	284,500
33	(*)			Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.	257,500
34	(*)			Fort Thomas, Ky.	415,000
35	(*)		No.	Fort Sam Houston, Tex.	\$740,700 793,000
36	(*)			Fort Douglas, Utah	1,533,700
37	(*)			Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	205,500
38	(*)		No.	Fort Devens, Mass.	\$200,900 791,900
39	(*)			Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	992,800
40	(*)			Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	600,000
41		W		Chanute Field, Ill.	1,770,000
42		W		Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo.	1,464,900
43		W		McChord Field, Wash.	815,900
44			No.	Fort Sherman, Canal Zone	2,494,850
45			No.	Fort Randolph, Canal Zone	850,000
46			No.	Fort Sill, Okla.	590,000
47			No.	Quarry Heights, Canal Zone	1,238,700
48			No.	Fort Amador, Canal Zone	69,600
49			No.	Fort Clayton, Canal Zone	328,000
50			No.	Corozal, Canal Zone	1,375,329
51			No.	Fort Davis, Canal Zone	945,650
52			No.	Various stations, Canal Zone	131,529
53		W		Ogden Ordnance Depot, Utah	365,500
54		W		Delaware Ordnance Depot, N. J.	1,229,350
55			No.	Fort Mason, Calif.	504,000
56	(*)			Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	1,360,000
57	(*)			Fort McPherson, Ga.	563,870
58	(*)			Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	108,000
59			No.	Carlisle Barracks, Pa.	500,500
60			No.	(a) Fort Armstrong, Territory of Hawaii	384,500
61		W		(b) Forts Ruger and DeRussy, Territory of Hawaii	1,369,600
62		W		(c) Hickam Field, Territory of Hawaii	540,000
63			No.	Wheeler Field, Territory of Hawaii	1,224,800
64			No.	Fort Shafter, Territory of Hawaii	784,300
65			No.	Tripler General Hospital, Territory of Hawaii	708,000
66			No.	Fort Sheridan, Ill.	1,506,257
67			No.	Fort Bliss, Tex.	656,900
68			No.	Fort Snelling, Minn.	473,400
69			No.	Fort Riley, Kans.	145,340
70			No.	Fort MacArthur, Calif.	275,520
71			No.	Fort McDowell, Calif.	276,000
72			No.	Fort Barrancas, Fla.	687,500
73			No.	Fort Bragg, N. C.	276,000
74			No.	Fort George G. Meade, Md.	689,250
75			No.	Fort Douglas, Utah	963,000
76			No.	Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.	300,000
77			No.	Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Ind.	738,460
78			No.	Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	175,000
79			No.	Holabird Quartermaster Depot, Md.	154,200
80			No.	Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	638,250
81			No.	Fort Slocum, N. Y.	521,600
82			No.	Fort Benning, Ga.	191,300
83			No.	Fort Crockett, Tex.	772,320
84			No.	Fort Clayton, Canal Zone	332,000
85			No.	Fort Davis, Canal Zone	698,900
86			No.	Fort Amador, Canal Zone	75,500
87			No.	Corozal, Canal Zone	1,448,200
88			No.	Quarry Heights, Canal Zone	63,900
89			No.	Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.	165,700
90			No.	Fort Hoyle, Md.	839,600
91			No.	Edgewood Arsenal, Md.	309,600
92		W		Schofield Barracks, Territory of Hawaii	1,406,375
93		W		Albrook Field, Canal Zone	1,229,320
94		W		McChord Field, Wash.	1,346,500
95			No.	Chanute Field, Ill.	591,900
96			No.	Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo.	388,780
97			No.	Fort Ruger, Territory of Hawaii	137,500
98			No.	Holabird Quartermaster Depot	328,560
99			No.	Fort Knox, Ky.	445,700
100			No.	Fort Lewis, Wash.	314,880
101			No.	Fort Logan, Colo.	189,230
102			No.	Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.	780,000
103			No.	Fort MacArthur, Calif.	344,650
104			No.	Fort Sill, Okla.	719,875
105			No.	Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.	846,940
106			No.	Raritan Arsenal, N. J.	158,100
107			No.	Anchorage, Alaska	21,250
108			No.	Chilkoot Barracks, Alaska	349,050
109			No.	Juneau, Alaska	34,550
110			No.	Fort Clark, Tex.	82,300
111			No.	Vancouver Barracks, Wash.	147,680
112			No.	Fort Bliss, Tex.	128,800
			No.	West Point, N. Y.	270,000
			No.	Camp Dix, N. J.	100,000

War Department construction priority list, Apr. 15, 1938—Continued

No.	Author- ized act, 394, Aug. 26, 1937	Public, 263, Aug. 12, 1935, Wilcox	Not au- thor- ized	Place	Cost
113			No.	Fort Monmouth, N. J.	\$296,700
114			No.	Delaware Ordnance Depot, N. J.	265,500
115			No.	Fort Devens, Mass.	186,060
116			No.	Fort Hancock, N. J.	262,000
117			No.	Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	83,071
118			No.	Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	102,500
119			No.	Fort Jay, N. Y.	1,135,700
120			No.	Fort Brady, Mich.	300,000
121			No.	Madison Barracks, N. Y.	315,600
122			No.	Fort Moultrie, S. C.	40,300
123			No.	Fort Myer, Va.	129,745
124			No.	New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.	54,360
125			No.	Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y.	238,000
126			No.	Schenectady General Depot, N. Y.	68,650
127		W		France Field, Canal Zone	1,650,000
128		W		Kelly Field, Tex.	682,800
129		W		McChord Field, Wash.	160,200
130		W		Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo.	423,600
131		W		Air Corps airways program	522,900
132		W		Sacramento Air Depot, Calif.	75,000
133		W		Randolph Field, Tex.	350,000
134		W		Patterson Field, Ohio	1,265,000
135		W		Duncan Field, Tex.	335,000
136		W		Mitchell Field, N. Y.	400,000
137		W		Maxwell Field, Ala.	300,000
138		W		March Field, Calif.	210,000
139			No.	Fort Sheridan, Ill.	157,440
140			No.	Fort Slocum, N. Y.	197,350
141			No.	Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	161,000
142			No.	Fort Sill, Okla.	228,000
143			No.	Fort Monroe, Va.	422,000
144			No.	Fort Missoula, Mont.	229,000
145			No.	Fort Benning, Ga.	1,019,100
146			No.	Fort Reno, Okla.	175,000
147			No.	Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	1,368,000
148			No.	Fort Des Moines, Iowa	111,000
149			No.	Fort Hoyle, Md.	692,000
150			No.	Edgewood Arsenal, Md.	216,000
151			No.	Letterman General Hospital, California	345,800
152			No.	Presidio of Monterey, Calif.	300,000
153			No.	Fort Belvoir, Va.	347,100
154			No.	Fort Clayton, Canal Zone	294,000
155			No.	Fort Davis, Canal Zone	109,800
156			No.	Fort Amador, Canal Zone	77,600
157			No.	Fort Story, Va.	20,600
158			No.	Fort Totten, N. Y.	304,000
159	(*)		No.	Fort D. A. Russell, Tex.	77,818
160	(*)		No.	Fort Niagara, N. Y.	324,000
161			No.	Tripler General Hospital, Territory of Hawaii	179,000
162			No.	Fort Belvoir, Va.	1,159,200
163			No.	Fort Sheridan, Ill.	1,229,800
164			No.	Camp Dix, N. J.	1,100,000
165			No.	Army Medical Center, District of Columbia	2,866,400
166			No.	Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y.	862,000
167			No.	Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	474,000
168			No.	Fort Clark, Tex.	500,000
169		W		Scott Field, Ill.	4,472,450
170		W		Hamilton Field, Calif.	380,000
171		W		Barksdale Field, La.	660,000
172		W		Selfridge Field, Mich.	817,500
173		W		Navigation aids at various stations	300,000
174		W		Wright Field, Ohio	660,000
175		W		Muroc Lake, Calif.	353,500
176		W		Bolling Field, D. C.	1,066,000
177		W		March Field, Calif.	330,000
178		W		Langley Field, Va.	440,000
179	(*)			Fort Wayne, Mich.	68,000
180	(*)			Frankford Arsenal, Pa.	255,000
181	(*)			Fort Francis E. Warren	277,500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

BILL TO PROVIDE AERONAUTICAL TRAINING AT COLLEGES AND TO ESTABLISH UNITED STATES AERONAUTICAL ACADEMY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to talk about a matter which is of extreme importance to the people of the United States. I have today introduced H. R. 10350, and the title and first section are self-explanatory, and are as follows:

TITLE TO ACT

A bill to provide aeronautical training at land-grant colleges, high schools, and private institutions, in the same manner as now provided for military education, and to further promote civil and military flying by establishing the United States Aeronautical Academy for the training of cadets and officers in military aeronautics, said academy to be upon a basis of equal dignity, importance, and scientific and tactical standing as the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

FIRST SECTION—STATEMENT OF POLICY

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the declared policy of Congress to foster and promote education from the viewpoint of aeronautical training by establishing the United States Aeronautical Academy, as provided in this act, and also be encouraging aviation training in the land-grant colleges, universities, high schools, and private educational institutions, in the same manner as now provided in the case of military training and Reserve Officers' Training Corps units. Such institutions throughout the United States shall be encouraged to establish "aviation units" in the same manner as they have heretofore established artillery, infantry, cavalry, and other units. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to detail to said institutions officers of the Air Corps in the same manner as officers are now detailed in other services.

Mr. Chairman, in our country we have wholly inadequate training for our aviation corps. Insofar as aviation is concerned, this country is miserably behind every modern country in the world. Now, I have an idea, and it is a good idea, I believe, because I have talked to a lot of people of every shade of opinion about it.

The land-grant colleges of the United States of America, for instance, have "horse troops"; they teach artillery; they teach infantry. What I would like to do is have the land-grant colleges of the United States of America install in each college a section devoted to the teaching of aviation.

At the present time we only have a few hundred air cadets, allocated at Randolph and Kelly Fields, and the number receiving training is absolutely insufficient for the Army and insufficient for civil training. There is a serious inadequacy of pilots for the various commercial companies of the United States of America.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to my distinguished friend, who is one of the best authorities and best friends of aviation in America.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted, as the gentleman is, to know that the new Director of the Bureau of Air Commerce is creating a division which has for its object the stimulation of private flying in this country. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Texas in bringing this important matter to our attention. I will cooperate in every possible way.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank the gentleman.

Now I will proceed to discuss the matter of aviation training through land-grant colleges. We could select—or the War Department could select—say 50 land-grant colleges, and each one of those land-grant colleges could have 50 air cadets selected from the whole cadet corps or student body. In that way we could train 2,500 boys a year; it could be increased or decreased as conditions require. At the present time we have only a few hundred cadets, as I stated. We might eliminate these horse troops and teach those boys something about aviation.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. We tried that once and had to discontinue the practice because we found we were killing too many of these youngsters in the colleges.

Mr. MAVERICK. That is deeply regrettable, but sentiment cannot stop the march of science. Moreover, as sensible people, we have to face the facts. I did not know any young men had been killed. But, sad as it is, more will be killed in airplane, automobile, and other accidents. With better training, fewer will be killed.

We have boys at Kelly Field and Randolph Field, the training schools for aviation in America, and some of them are killed. Boys are being killed all over the world as far as aviation is concerned, but aviation is becoming much more modern every day. Considering the inevitability of the increase in aviation, if we establish this course in the land-grant colleges it will be a good thing from every angle.

I also favor the establishment of the United States aeronautical college mentioned in the bill which I have introduced, on the same basis as the Naval College and the Mil-

tary College, because we are so woefully behind with our aviation education.

Mr. MAY. I agree with the remarks and position of my colleague. May I say for his information that I issued a press release last week to one newspaper in each county in my State.

I have had more than 75 responses to that release from young men who want to take air training.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank my chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and I am absolutely sure that is a good thing, because the gentleman from Kentucky and I do not agree very often. If we agree, we know it is all right!

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, my good friend.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I hope the gentleman does not mean what he said a few minutes ago—that he would abolish the cavalry.

Mr. MAVERICK. We would not abolish cavalry, and we would not take a horse away from the district of the gentleman from Texas. There is a necessity for cavalry, and some of it is rightfully in the gentleman's district. We just want to have more airplanes, that is all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I add to the remarks of the gentleman in connection with the failure of the Federal Government to give aviation its proper place that other nations of the world are stimulating flying and asking that their Government help private flyers. Certainly the provisions of the proposed legislation should commend themselves to the sympathetic attention of the membership of this House.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank the gentleman. Aviation is such a big thing the Government should develop its training on a very wide scale.

Before I conclude, let us discuss some of the facts. At the present time we have 28,000,000 automobiles and 15,000 airplanes. There was a time when it was thought the horse would never be displaced by the automobile. The airplane will never displace the automobile, but surely the number of airplanes used will increase enormously. So let us use our heads and be prepared.

I hope the gentlemen will support the bill I have introduced to give aviation the recognition it ought to have by establishing an aeronautical college and giving aeronautical training in the land-grant colleges of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday last I discussed on the floor of the House the two palaces which we are constructing in the Philippine Islands. At that time and since that time attempts have been made to apply a liberal coat of whitewash to both Gov. Frank Murphy, of Michigan, former High Commissioner, and High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt in an effort to absolve them from any responsibility for the construction of these two palaces.

I have gone back over the records of the committees of both the Senate and the House and the reports of the Governors General. I went to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department this morning and obtained the original tentative plans submitted by the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands to the State Department and by them to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. The plans were originally drafted at Manila and were submitted in tentative form to the Procurement Division of the Treasury through the State Department by the Governor General, so the Procurement Division has informed me.

I examined the original tentative plans of these two palaces prepared at Manila and approved by the Governors General. The plan of the smaller palace had on it the word "Approved" and it was signed "Paul V. McNutt, High Commissioner." The palace that Mr. McNutt wanted to build was 66 feet wide,

161 feet long, and 43 feet high. The palace as it will be constructed from plans of the Procurement Division is 64 feet by 134 feet. The White House is 85 feet by 170 feet.

The White House is only 19 feet wider and 9 feet longer than the McNutt palace which is to be used as a summer home, and to which I referred as having 47 rooms.

The original tentative plans for the larger palace at Manila, the one Gov. Frank Murphy wanted to build, as submitted carry the words "Approved, Frank Murphy, High Commissioner." The White House is 85 feet wide and 170 feet long. The palace as we are now building at Manila is 134 feet wide and 203 feet long. The Murphy palace would have been 141 feet wide and 266 feet long. Governor Murphy wanted to build a palace at Manila that was 84 feet wider and 64 feet longer than the White House, but the Procurement Division, or somebody, cut it down to where it is only 33 feet wider and 49 feet longer than the White House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Let me finish my statement first, please. The names are signed in their own handwriting on the plans themselves. The House report quotes Brigadier General Cox, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department, as follows:

Governor General Murphy, after a careful study of the situation in the island, has expressed the view that the amount estimated in the bill (\$1,000,000) is very reasonable.

The Senate committee report is as follows:

It was made to appear to your committee that the Governor General of the islands (Mr. Murphy) had expressed the view that the amount stated in the bill was entirely reasonable.

On June 25, 1935, after the bill had been reported out for \$1,000,000, President Roosevelt submitted to the Senate a supplementary estimate upon recommendation of the Budget Bureau for \$750,000.

Mr. Chairman, the two gentlemen from Michigan on the Democratic side of the aisle may call this cheap politics, but I call it mighty expensive politics and a wasteful expenditure of the people's money. This is all the more true since we are getting out of the Philippine Islands in 1946. According to the statement made in the Senate and approved by Senator TYDINGS, we own over 300,000 acres of land in the Philippines now. The land and buildings there are inventoried at more than \$18,000,000. Under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, we are turning this property over to the Philippine Government in 1946. Now, we own 300,017 acres of land because we created these 17 acres out of Manila Bay. The Philippine Islands have cost us from 1898 to 1934 \$835,000,000, and when you add the cost since that time it runs close to a billion dollars. If you add the newly created cost of the big navy made necessary by a fear that Japan will attack the islands, you will add another billion or two. How long are we going to keep this up and spend large amounts of money in the Philippine Islands when we are giving them their complete independence at their request in 1946. You can try to apply the whitewash brush to Governor Frank Murphy and High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt. You cannot cover up the little word "approved" on the plans and specifications and beneath which they by their own hand affixed their names. They themselves fixed their responsibility beyond contradiction.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman tell us where we are going to get the money to build these palaces for McNutt?

Mr. ENGEL. It will be raised by taxation, and Mr. Roosevelt said in 1932 that "taxes are paid in the sweat of everyone who labors."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN].

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, the chief duty of the Congress at this time, in the face of increasing unemployment and economic uncertainty, is to help the job maker create jobs. This means that we must encourage business and industry in every way possible.

In 1936 I opposed the revenue act because I firmly believed it contained new tax provisions that would prove harmful to corporate industry, and we must remember that most business today is operated under the corporate form. When the 1938 Revenue Act was on the floor of the House, I favored outright repeal of the undistributed-profits tax and drastic revision or outright repeal of the capital-gains tax. It was, and still is, my firm belief that these taxes strike at the root of industrial security.

It is good industrial practice to establish reserves for expansion which can also be used to carry pay rolls along in stringent times. This lesson should have been well learned during 1930-33, when many corporations were able to survive only by expending their reserves. It is thus a useful means of lowering the peaks of prosperity and filling in the valleys of depression, and it is up to this Government to make certain that every possible means of leveling the economic cycle to a good average of normalcy is put into full and free use by industry. Yet these taxes have the opposite effect.

They force corporations to pay out practically their entire profits in dividend declarations or forfeit considerable sums to the Government as a penalty. The tax does not have revenue production as its purpose, but rather it attempts to determine the reserve policy of business and industry. For this reason alone it is not a good tax.

Reserve policy should be determined by the stockholders, who may rightfully choose long-time security of their investment in preference to an immediate dividend. Similarly, the capital-gains tax, heavily taxing this year's gains without thought of last year's losses or next year's possible emergency, is not sufficiently mindful of the stockholders' interest. Naturally, theirs is the gain taxed or the loss disregarded by this taxing policy. Nor is it sufficiently mindful of labor's interest, for continued employment depends on a stable financial structure.

It is my sincere hope that the conferees appointed to represent this House in consultation with the Senate conferees will concur in the Senate version of the 1938 Revenue Act. For the 1936 Revenue Act to remain in force would be a tragedy of tax policy, and the House version of the 1938 Revenue Act did not go far enough in the removal of these bad features.

The Senate version will certainly give encouragement to business and industry, who at least will know that the Federal Government is seeking the revenue it needs to operate, but is not delving into the field of determining the reserve policy of private business. We have no place there whatever, beyond the possible service we might render by urging reserve increases during good business years and expenditure of these funds by maintaining employment during poor business years. This money will create more purchasing power when used to employ men in industry than when disbursed to stockholders.

Federal expenditure on public works at this time may well have its needed place in fighting the recession. But our only hope for progress toward normalcy and for maintenance of that favored position is for us to encourage private business and private industry to so manage their affairs that we may now have reemployment and thereafter maintain employment of our people in private industry.

Finding job makers is the most important quest of our people today. We need enterprising men who can gather together the necessary capital to employ those people who are eager to work in order that they may produce a more generous supply of material goods. We all need shoes; we all need clothing; most of us can use a greater variety of food at our table; we need better housing; and the list could go on and on.

We must look to private industry to supply this employment, and we must therefore encourage the private job maker. We must leave enough of the profit motive to encourage him to undertake the risks of production, and we must leave him free from threats of too much governmental

regulation, so he must not too often be required to change his policy, for these changes create insecurity.

It appears to me that both the taxation activities and the regulatory activities of the Government during the past 20 or 30 years could stand a good deal of scrutiny.

Let us free industry and commerce in order that the economic laws of a nation rich in natural resources and in human labor and enterprise can work out its destiny of bountiful living. Let us encourage industry and business to create jobs. All our people are waiting for is assurance that a fair profit will not be taxed or regulated out of existence.

Let us help the private job maker create jobs. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, the minority leader of the House, the gentleman from New York, read to the Members of this House on April 13 an article from the New York Herald Tribune of April 12 entitled "More Adversity." The speaker and the writer of the article were both commenting upon the news of the seven-county election held in Oregon on April 8 for the purpose of creating a special utility district.

This power-district election in far-away Oregon is not without significance in the Nation-wide battle between public and private power. The reactionary and pro-utility Herald Tribune exults over the defeat of a public power district. Since this rural election has caused Nation-wide comment, I desire to explain it from my point of view.

Since the newspaper figures were incomplete, I am not quoting them, but will in a moment give the actual figures of the election, as I desire to comment upon them. Our colleague from New York drew from the election the conclusion that the people "do not want these gigantic projects imposed upon them from Washington * * * Bonneville Dam will be completed in about a year, but the people of the immediate vicinity have already emphatically disapproved the proposed distribution scheme." Now I know that our colleague would not misrepresent facts, but the source from which he drew them the Herald Tribune—is not entirely unprejudiced. Its article is so full of misstatements that it could be ignored, except that it drew remarks from such a distinguished commentator.

PRIVATE UTILITIES CANNOT GIVE CHEAPEST RATES

The real battle in Oregon was caused by the determination of the privately owned utilities to distribute the power from Bonneville through their own existing lines, and force the Government to restrict sales to industry at the bus bar. The people made a struggle to organize a seven-county public power district, taking in parts of seven counties, where they would own their distributing system and pass on to the consumer the full benefit of the low rate of the Government power plant at Bonneville. It is a well-known fact that cannot be repeated too often, that the cost of electricity to the ultimate consumer is largely in transmission and distribution. The cost of generation rarely exceeds 10 percent of the consumer's electric bill. The facts of the case are, the utilities are making a fight to hold their present capital structures. They have got to win, or squeeze the water out of their overcapitalizations. That is the cause of their anxiety. The private utilities really cannot pass on to the people the benefits of the low rates they may secure at the public generating plant at Bonneville. If they did so, they would then have to reduce their rates in the big centers like Portland. This would break their rate structure and would not give enough income to support their big issues of bonds and stocks. The utilities must win, or lose their preferred status which is their ability to tax the people by way of electric-light rates. They need these funds to sustain, throughout the Nation, six or seven billions of water that has been pumped into their capitalization and which they desire to freeze into it as the railroads have done. Of course they have money to pay for advertising, to pay speakers, to put on their almost irresistible propaganda.

BONNEVILLE POWER SOLD WHOLESALE ONLY

I desire to make it clearly understood that Bonneville power project was not the issue of the election, nor was it a question of transmission of the power from that project. It was a question of local distribution of power, and by whom cities and rural communities should be served, whether by public or private agencies. It has never been proposed that the Government, through its Bonneville administration, should enter into the business of distributing power retail. It is proposed that it shall generate power and transmit it to the city gates—to the local distributing system. So far the transmission lines have not been built because they are awaiting appropriation by this Congress. The Bonneville Act allows the distribution of its power directly through power districts and city public plants, or through private companies under contract protection. The choice under the law rests entirely with the people served. Their choice should be guided by facts and not by propaganda.

BONNEVILLE POWER IN DEMAND

The facts of the case are that the power generated at the two Bonneville units already installed has been oversubscribed. The present installed capacity at Bonneville is 86,400 kilowatts. Against this capacity Administrator Ross has power requests totaling 290,700 kilowatts. Seventy-nine percent of this amount represents public power-district requirements in Washington, 1.5 percent in Oregon, and 19.5 percent industrial requests. In addition, the private power companies, during this election, indicated that they could use at least 40 percent of the present installed capacity. The facts and figures presented herein show that a market exists for all the power Bonneville can generate. The recent election has no bearing either way on the plant's market. The Bonneville administrator had nothing whatsoever to do with the seven-county election which was determined upon by the people themselves and carried through by them.

In order to begin immediate repayments to the Government for the money it has lent to build this project, we are now requesting from Congress appropriations for two more units, in order to meet immediate demands and to bring money into the treasury for the purpose of facing the repayment to the Government. The outlook is for quick sale of the Bonneville power just as fast as it can be generated. There is actually a tremendous demand.

The present struggle results from the apparent determination of the private power companies to hold the field against public distribution. The law enacted by this Congress provides that 50 percent of the power shall be held for public ownership systems which shall be given preferential rights until 1941. The object of this reservation was to give the public-utility districts an opportunity to organize for power distribution.

PUBLIC POWER DISTRICTS

In the State of Washington, there are 18 utility districts legally organized, ready to use Bonneville power, and 12 more will vote on organization this fall. Washington has outstripped Oregon in this matter because of its more advantageous utility district law enacted in 1931, and already several times sustained by the supreme court of the State. The Washington law provides for revenue certificates plus a 2-mill levy for organization expense, with no pay for directors. Washington public-power districts are now struggling to finance themselves and while they have a representative in the East seeking for private financing, it is announced that the private utilities, with their enormous overcapitalization, are about to become partners of the Government, and that they are to be privileged to walk into the offices of the R. F. C. in order to secure new funds. Any agency which furnishes additional funds for the private utilities, does, of necessity, accept part of the burden of the overcapitalization which holds up the high-rate structures.

The Oregon law, also enacted in 1931, to put into effect the constitutional amendment voted through the influence of the State Grange, provides for setting up power districts

by vote of the people, but requires financing through general obligation bonds, thus giving an opportunity for strong objection and tremendous propaganda campaigns. I assure you this opening was not overlooked, and the election to which the gentleman referred was not an election in which the interest was power, or public power, or the use of Bonneville, but it was an election centering on taxation, which became the issue. The sponsors of the Oregon public power acts are now giving consideration to amendments which will in many ways facilitate the establishment of public-power districts in Oregon, particularly by permitting the sale of utility revenue bonds retireable, both as to principal and interest, out of district earnings, rather than the general obligation bonds now specified in the law.

It has been a very difficult thing to secure public power legislation in Oregon, and the history of constitutional amendments and enabling acts is a record highly creditable to the public spirit and tenacity of those public-power advocates who directed the campaigns. There have been vetoes and referendums and lost elections in many bitterly contested fights. Step by step the public-power advocates have won, and they will win through to final victory. The people of Oregon are fully alive to the great benefits which will come to the Northwest through the Bonneville power and navigation project, and they are determined that the benefits shall be widespread, and shall not be reserved solely for the private utilities.

THE POWER DISTRICT ELECTION OF APRIL 8

The election of April 8 was the first election in Oregon providing for the formation of a power district covering more than one county, and including rural and urban territory. The result was really amazing. The district is not adjacent to Bonneville, but over 100 miles distant from it, and was but a small part of the territory which can easily be supplied with power from that great dam. It did not take in any large cities. From latest returns, there were 13,537 votes for the seven-county power district, and 21,524 against it. This, in spite of bonds, taxes, and a private utility attack probably unparalleled in the long struggle for public ownership. Four out of forty-five small cities voted for the project. There are two municipally owned plants in the counties but they did not vote on the proposition. Four out of nine unincorporated areas also gave a favorable vote. It is not yet legally determined whether the territory which voted favorably shall be formed into a public power district. By the time districts are organized in Oregon and ready to operate the State will have a more satisfactory law, even if it must come through the initiative. The cause will profit by the weaknesses shown in this campaign. There are many other public power elections pending in Oregon, where they will be held frequently from now on. These are in smaller districts, each within one county.

THE PRELIMINARY SKIRMISH OF A BIG BATTLE

This preliminary skirmish steels the arm for the coming battle. I am firmly convinced that the people of Oregon will rise in their might and demand that publicly owned distributing systems shall make available the cheap power of Bonneville. Oregonian public power advocates cannot believe that when the facts are fairly presented to our people they will allow all the cheap power from Bonneville to pass into the States of Washington and Idaho, leaving Oregon citizens to continue to contribute to Wall Street manipulators at least twice as much as they ought to pay for electric current, or what they would pay if they distributed cooperatively the current Bonneville will soon be ready to deliver. It is inconceivable that the people organized for governmental purposes should be prevented by big aggregations of private capital from exercising their governmental powers. The private utilities claim that they are hampered by governmental actions or restrictions, but they must be rejoicing over their very successful effort to crush public initiative. Surely the people in their government should have a free field without being cowed and intimidated and actually con-

trolled by the private utilities. When the people decide that they will furnish for themselves all the essentials, including light as well as water and highways, the utilities will be obliged to yield. I repeat, the private utilities cannot give to the people the reduction that is due them in their electric-light bills.

The whole episode reminds me of the fight in Oregon when I was Governor 15 years ago, to pass and hold an income-tax law. We secured enactment of a law under which an income tax was levied. Three million dollars had been collected the first year, and the money used to reduce the property tax. Under a propaganda drive, the people repealed that law, took back upon their own shoulders the burden of raising that money through a property tax. We who believed that taxes should be based on the ability to pay, never gave up our fight for the income tax as against the sales tax, and finally won our point.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION NEEDED IN OREGON

Our people in the Northwest want more electric power and they want it at rates comparable with the rates established by the publicly owned plants at Tacoma, Wash., and Eugene, Oreg., which are our present yardsticks. Oregon's rural population has never enjoyed electricity because the private power companies have refused reasonable extensions, have held rates high, and have otherwise penalized rural use. Oregon has profited by the rural-electrification program of the Federal Government, and districts are being established. Only 39.7 percent of the farms in Oregon are now supplied with electricity, and these at the rates largely beyond the paying ability of farmers. In the State of Washington, 52.9 percent have rural electrification. California, the second in the Union, has 67.6 percent of farms served. In Oregon, electrical development has been checked through the reactionary and subversive policies of the private utilities. These private companies have been pushing their rural extensions ever since the day Bonneville was proposed. They have had people sign on the dotted line at high rates. When these signatures were secured, most of the people had not heard that a Government-owned plant was probable and that public distribution systems would be possible. The private companies preempted the best territory and left thinly settled districts helpless, making extension costs prohibitive. It has been amusing to note the newspaper publicity given very slight reduction in private power company rates during Bonneville construction. The reductions have been too small to be noticed in bills, but may be credited to Bonneville.

UTILITY PROPAGANDA ATTACKS POWER DISTRICTS

This election did prove the power of propaganda. Formerly it was possible through required reports to regulatory bodies, to ascertain something of the cost of such campaigns. Since the dissolution of the old National Electric Light Association, and the organization of what is known as the Edison Electric Institute, with their improved methods for hiding facts, it is impossible to learn just how much of the rate payer's money goes into propaganda. It is commonly reported now that they have perfected more refined and subtle methods. It is said that a slush fund for propaganda and illicit expenses, such as the purchase of officials, is now built up by percentage rebates given managements of private utilities by the manufacturers and companies which sell the utilities electric apparatus. This fund goes into New York banks and is quietly passed through the country to pay for advertisements, meetings, "canned" newspaper editorials, and "influence." Only cash paid, no checks given, no receipts taken.

The opposition encountered by the courageous and able sponsors of the seven-county district would have terrified and discouraged men less stout-hearted. I have a collection of campaign literature put out by the private utilities which should be kept in the archives so that future generations of public-power users may have some understanding of the courage of their forbears. When the Bonneville Act was

pending in this Congress I insisted upon having written into it a section which would provide the services of Government experts who should help in the organization of public power districts proposing to distribute power from a Government-owned plant. I then foresaw the difficulties of newly organized groups without avenues of publicity and without the funds for campaigning. The private utilities spent thousands upon thousands of dollars for newspaper advertising, for printed and mimeographed statements which stuffed the mail boxes, for mass meetings, and for radio speeches by rural housewives and others, into whose mouths they put the most amazing bits of wisdom on utility policies. They organized "protective associations." They worked day and night with the announced purpose of protecting the simple people of these seven counties from their own folly. No public utility operating since electricity became available has ever exhibited such concern for the "welfare" of the consumers. Of course, this campaign was paid for by the users of electricity, and by the very rate payers who were persuaded by them to remain in bondage. The consumers will be paying for this campaign for months or years to come. The State public utilities commissioner rushed into the fray with the announcement that his beneficent organization would have "no control over rates charged by proposed public-utility districts"; and, "My department also would have no control over any indebtedness . . . authorized by the present utility district law." He went on to say that the privately owned utilities must answer to his office for every rate and expenditure, and that he would "insist that ultimate consumers of Bonneville power receive every benefit possible, if the power is distributed by existing privately owned electric companies." This is required by the Bonneville Act and should give the commissioner no concern. Is it any wonder that the margin against the seven-power utility district was 7,987 who preferred to remain under the protecting wings of the public utility commissioner who was so concerned for the private utilities?

TAXATION MADE THE BOGEY

In every fight for public power systems, taxation is the bogey. I have tried to make it clear in speeches on the floor of this House that private utilities operate on a cost-plus basis, that they levy hidden sales taxes but never pay any direct taxes. They simply collect taxes from the rate payers. It is a matter of nomenclature only. They pay a certain sum to a unit of government—county, city, or State, and they call that sum taxes, whereas, it is actually just a fixed portion of the consumer's electric power rates. A certain portion is assigned to power-company profits, a certain portion for public payments, and a very large and certain portion for propaganda which will keep the people from enjoying the benefits of cheaper rates and freedom in determining how the income shall be divided.

Under the Oregon law the State cannot tax publicly owned utilities. We have some very successful municipal public power plants, and they have, in lieu of taxes, lighted the city streets and public buildings, and they have in some places used their income for other city expenses, substituting light and power revenue for taxes. I am now collecting figures for tabular presentation of these facts. They will show conclusively that the public power plants actually contribute more toward the costs of government than do the private power plants which use the tax argument against public ownership. Taxation and general obligation bonds are not essential to the establishment of a public power district as revenue certificate bonds are marketable.

Another point which is of first importance and must not be overlooked in the struggle between public and private power is the fact that the private utilities never pay out and thus never get to the point where the rate base is not largely determined by their indebtedness. Publicly owned plants move forward to a debt-free status, with constantly diminishing rates. The private utilities may well fear the competition of publicly owned plants. The publicly owned

plants may well move toward the acquisition, at a fair valuation, of competitive privately owned utilities.

The real issue in the seven-county election in Oregon was then not power, but taxes. As a result of the ruling of the attorney general of the State, wide publicity was given by subsidized opponents to the contention that any bonds issued would become general obligation bonds, and that the power facilities would be tax-free. Through the written and spoken word, the private power companies carried the idea to the people that general obligation bonds meant a mortgage on the home and the farm, and being tax-free, the displaced power company taxes would be shifted to property owners. The tax-free argument was carried to ridiculous extremes. For example, there is a strong sentiment in Oregon for social security. Realizing this sentiment, subsidized opposition created the false impression that tax exemption would eliminate any social-security measures. People unfamiliar with the Oregon situation have been led to believe that stock ownership influenced the result. This is not the fact. The Portland private company in recent years sold about \$15,000,000 of fraudulent stock to their customers, with resulting heavy losses.

One of the gems brought out in this contest should be given wider publicity than it secured through the readers of the local paper at Canyon City, Ore. I therefore quote the comments of the editor of the Blue Mountain Eagle, Mr. Clint Haight, as he refers to one of the utility campaigners:

He blats out that the utilities cannot compete with Bonneville, because they pay a great bill of taxes, while Government plants pay none. What a beam of light!

It reminds one of a one-cylinder firefly defying the great orb of day. The electric light companies of Portland pay no taxes (unless undistributed profits). The consumer pays the tax; while the company is just a bill collector. Railroads pay no taxes; they collect from the shipper. Utilities have no "holler" coming, but the customer has, and the utilities have been good collectors and been pretty decent about it, and have not complained, because they did not pay it.

Taxes are part of the cost; like clerk hire, rents, upkeep, etc.; all added together, and presented to the consumer, in the form of a bill each month. No mystery in this.

A print shop and storekeeper does not pay for his clerks, light, rent, taxes, insurance, etc. He can't. The customer pays it, and he knows it, and so does everybody, for it is the only way business can be done; and that is proper, and sound economics. But to hear the Rajah of the Kingdom of Oregon Voter, one might think that the light companies of Portland pay their taxes out of their inheritances or their remittance from grandfather's estate.

PUBLIC POWER MOVES FORWARD

Public power advocates should be greatly heartened by this election, even though the cause was lost temporarily. It showed what a small army of raw recruits can do when up against seasoned troops, armed with every device possible of purchase with unlimited funds, and backed by agencies of Government which will allow them to write the costs into the consumers' bills. I rejoice that our people have the courage to come back for more elections. Those who voted against the project were frightened by the terrible stories of taxes and bonds and the bogies dressed up by the power companies. I am surprised that no fighter on the people's side thought to fix up a bogey which would have effectually scared the power companies and sent them running from the fray. It is only 10 years ago that these same people went into these same counties with a campaign, aided by these same newspapers and these same bankers, and these same chambers of commerce. That campaign had as its objective the confiscation of the savings of the people of those counties, under the guise of "investment" in Central Public Service, which was then the owner of Pepco, as well as of Seattle Gas. The operating company and its "investors" were swindled out of \$6,753,748, and the people who now use electricity in that section are paying rates sufficiently high to earn dividends upon that money stolen from the stockholders. It was reported to me that people of small means in a single one of these counties which voted "no" on the seven-county power project, lost over \$500,000 in that

ruthless utility raid. The facts were set forth in the Oregon papers again and again. People do, indeed, have short memories.

BONNEVILLE THE NATION'S YARDSTICK

Oregon, Washington, and Idaho have the opportunity to establish the yardstick of the Nation for the price of electric current. In years to come what will stand out as the great achievement of this administration? Undoubtedly the dams—Grand Coulee and Bonneville, on the Columbia River. You cannot repeal a dam. You cannot deceive all the people at the same time if you can get the facts to them. The believers in public distribution of power have no notion of quitting the fight. We are just making our plans for another battle, and then another, and another, if necessary. Believing in the justice of our cause, we shall continue until we win. We believe the leaders will be developed in the near future who will be able to convince the people of the justice of the cause of public ownership of all activities which, by their very nature, are monopolies.

Oregon is a State which has taken the lead in the Nation in the cause of the people's government. We have long had the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, and we gave to the Nation the idea of the popular election of Senators. The people have not changed. They have not become reactionary, nor are they timid utility dupes. The power election indicates only that a small majority of Oregon citizens have yielded momentarily to reactionary leadership. They will take a good look at this business. They will resolve to understand it, and they will find a way to get what they want. Bonneville, to the people of Oregon, means opportunity beyond anything ever before opened to them. Those who put over this public power campaign are the third generation of pioneers to whom Oregon will in the future pay homage. First, we had those who crossed the plains; then we had those who gave us our political institutions; now comes the group fighting to bestow upon Oregon a heritage of economic freedom.

THE YARDSTICK APPLIED

To show the great diversity in present rates and where the overcharges are most flagrant, I give herewith a rate table of a group of Oregon cities in my district, showing how these compare with our present yardsticks of Tacoma, Wash., and Eugene and Milton, Oreg., all publicly owned. These figures are for the most part from monthly bills secured by recent correspondence. A few items are from the 1937 rate series B of the Federal Power Commission. These tables show what publicly owned plants can do for people.

Twenty-five to forty kilowatt-hours per month represents consumption from lighting and small appliances. One hundred kilowatt-hours per month represents light, appliances, and refrigeration. Two hundred and fifty kilowatt-hours per month, electric stove in addition to above. Five hundred kilowatt-hours per month, water heating in addition to above.

Residential service charges

Community	Population	Monthly consumption (kilowatt-hour.)				
		25	40	100	250	500
Eugene	18,901	\$1.00	\$1.35	\$2.55	\$4.50	\$7.13
Tacoma, Wash.		1.13	1.52	2.12	3.62	6.12
Baker	7,858	1.98	3.03	4.98	8.23	11.98
Bend	8,848	1.91	2.76	4.56	8.06	10.06
Burns	2,599	2.75	4.40	5.80	9.10	11.60
Condon	940	2.39	3.17	4.97	8.27	10.27
Enterprise	1,379	2.43	3.20	5.00	8.20	10.20
Fossil	538	2.39	3.17	4.97	8.27	10.27
Heppner	1,190	2.39	3.17	4.97	8.27	10.27
Hood River	2,757	1.60	2.44	4.24	7.74	9.74
Klamath Falls	16,093	1.50	2.40	4.20	7.01	10.14
La Grande	8,050	1.98	3.03	4.98	8.23	11.98
Lakeview	1,799	3.00	4.80	6.40	9.90	12.40
Madras	291	2.04	2.99	4.79	8.29	10.29
Milton	1,876	1.57	2.11	3.57	6.62	7.62
Ontario	1,941	1.66	2.49	4.30	6.75	8.60
Pendleton	6,621	1.60	2.44	4.24	7.74	12.79
Prineville	1,027	2.04	2.99	4.79	8.29	10.29
The Dalles	5,833	1.60	2.44	4.24	7.74	9.74

Business-house bills

Community	Demand in kilowatts				
	0.75	1.5	3.0	6.0	12.0
	Kilowatt-hours per month				
	50	150	375	750	1,500
Eugene	\$1.80	\$3.90	\$8.40	\$15.90	\$30.90
Tacoma, Wash.	1.75	5.25	11.25	22.50	42.00
Baker	3.73	10.73	22.98	40.73	63.23
Bend	3.66	9.16	20.41	35.41	60.41
Burns	5.40	14.25	27.50	47.00	86.00
Hood River	3.10	9.10	20.85	38.10	63.10
Klamath Falls	3.00	9.00	21.25	35.00	57.50
La Grande	3.73	10.73	22.98	40.73	63.23
Milton	2.70	7.20	15.30	25.65	45.90
Ontario	3.04	8.54	18.35	31.85	53.45
Pendleton	3.10	9.10	20.85	38.10	63.10
The Dalles	3.10	9.10	20.85	38.10	63.10

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including fuel for and pay of superintendents and the superintendent at Mexico City, and other employees; purchase of land; purchase of tools and materials; and for the repair, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles; care and maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate graves, and including the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single approach road to any national cemetery constructed under special act of Congress; headstones for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines under the acts approved March 3, 1873 (24 U. S. C. 279), February 3, 1879 (24 U. S. C. 280), March 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 56), March 14, 1914 (38 Stat. 768), and February 26, 1929 (24 U. S. C. 280a), and civilians interred in post cemeteries; recovery of bodies and disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army under act approved March 9, 1928 (10 U. S. C. 916); travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains of military personnel and civilian employees; for repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, etc., made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell; care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Mound in Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago, the Confederate Stockade Cemetery at Johnstons Island, the Confederate burial plats owned by the United States in Confederate Cemetery at North Alton, the Confederate Cemetery, Camp Chase, at Columbus, the Confederate Cemetery at Point Lookout, and the Confederate Cemetery at Rock Island; and for care and maintenance of graves used by the Army for burials in commercial cemeteries, \$1,366,698, and in addition, \$25,000 of the appropriation "Cemeterial expenses, War Department, 1938," such amount of such appropriation being hereby reappropriated: *Provided*, That no railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way which may have been acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach upon any roads or walks constructed thereon and maintained by the United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for repairing any roadway not owned by the United States within the corporate limits of any city, town, or village.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON of Texas: Page 3, line 16, before the colon, insert: "and of the total of such sums, \$25,000 shall be available for the development of the Fort Bliss National Cemetery, as authorized by the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1514)."

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment, inasmuch as it does not change the sum total of the item.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

For the maintenance of the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands as authorized by subsection 4 of section 7 of the act approved March 24, 1934 (48

Stat., p. 456), including salaries and wages; rental, furnishings, equipment, maintenance, renovation, and repair of office quarters and living quarters for the High Commissioner; supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; traveling expenses, including for persons appointed hereunder within the United States and their families, actual expenses of travel and transportation of household effects from their homes in the United States to the Philippine Islands, and return, utilizing Government vessels whenever practicable; operation, maintenance, and repair of motor vehicles, purchase and exchange of three automobiles at prices not to exceed \$2,600 for one and \$1,200 each for two, and all other necessary expenses, \$181,930, of which amount \$2,500 shall be available as of April 1, 1938, and of which amount not exceeding \$10,000 shall be available for expenditure in the discretion of the High Commissioner for maintenance of his household and such other purposes as he may deem proper: *Provided*, That the salary of the legal adviser and the financial expert shall not exceed the annual rate of \$10,000 and \$9,000 each, respectively: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any purchase or service rendered under this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$100.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph on the ground that the part of the paragraph commencing on page 5, line 8, with the word "of," and going down to the word "*Provided*," in line 13, is legislation on an appropriation and therefore not authorized.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a border-line case and that the Chair might logically rule either way. The office of the Philippine High Commissioner was created in the act of March 4, 1934 (48 Stat. 456-465). In subsection 7 of section 4 of that act it is provided that—

The United States High Commissioner shall receive the same compensation as is now received by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

I wish to emphasize that word "compensation."

The first appropriation for this office was carried in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, was a member of the subcommittee which reported that bill, which evidently was influenced to allow this \$10,000 item because of that word "compensation." During the hearings on that bill the then chairman, Mr. BUCHANAN, made this inquiry of General Cox, who was then Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs:

The question is: Under the law, can compensation be held to include only the salary? I am talking about the law.

General Cox replied—

It is my understanding that compensation includes both salary and other allowances.

Now, later, Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for this office was first considered by the War Department subcommittee, which was for the fiscal year 1937, this very item was under consideration, and here is the testimony at that time:

Mr. DICKWEILER. Then there is also an item of \$10,000 for special and miscellaneous expenses. What is that for?

Colonel STOCKTON. It is a discretionary fund. The Governor General had a much larger allowance than that, sir.

Mr. DICKWEILER. What amount?

Colonel STOCKTON. The Governor General had an item of \$15,000, and the appropriation act of the Tenth Philippine Legislature for 1935 provides that the fund shall be expended in the discretion of the Governor General, amounting to 30,000 pesos.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the act I have cited—the act of March 4, 1934, provided that the High Commissioner should receive the same compensation as the Governor General had been receiving, and it would seem from the testimony I have quoted that the view heretofore entertained has been that compensation does not refer to salary alone, but embraces this extra allowance which the High Commissioner may expend at his discretion, because the Governor General previously had been granted such an allowance.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, under this provision the High Commissioner has discretion to spend this \$10,000 for

any purpose he may deem proper. He can buy cats or dogs or liquor or anything else. I know of no law which authorizes him to spend money at his discretion. Surely there is no law which gives him the right to spend money in that way. I maintain that it is clearly legislation and for that reason I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question in the mind of the Chair is whether or not the law authorizes such an appropriation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] admits that this is on the border line. The Chair followed the gentleman's reasoning, but the only law that the Chair has been able to discover that bears directly upon this with reference to authorizing anything other than the salary of the High Commissioner, is found in the United States Code, title 48, which provides that his salary—

Shall be \$18,000, and in addition thereto, that he shall be entitled to the occupancy of the building used prior to August 20, 1916, by the Chief Executive of the Philippines, with the furniture and effects therein.

What bothers the mind of the Chair is that there is nothing there to indicate that the High Commissioner can use his discretion to spend the amount of money mentioned in the bill. It occurs to the Chair that the language objected to and to which the point of order is made, beginning in line 8 with the word "of," down to and including the word "proper" in line 13, is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 5, line 8, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$181,930" and insert in lieu thereof "\$176,400."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the entire section had gone out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Michigan made the point of order and specifically stated that the point of order was to the language beginning with the word "of" in line 8, down to and including the word "proper" in line 13. The Chair understood that to be the gentleman's original point of order.

Mr. ENGEL. I made the point of order against the paragraph upon the ground that that part of the paragraph to which the Chair refers is subject to a point of order, but I accept the ruling of the Chair that it strikes out just those lines and so modify my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will so hold; therefore the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia to other portions of the paragraph is in order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, while we are spending billions of dollars, I do not know whether the House will be much interested in saving \$5,530. Look at page 5 of the committee report and see what the \$5,530 is for. It is an allowance by the committee over the Budget. Keep in mind that the Budget authorized an increase of approximately \$28,000 for the office of the High Commissioner for the fiscal year 1939, over what has been appropriated for the present fiscal year. But Governor McNutt appeared before the committee and convinced them they ought to give \$5,530 above that, and it is that increase over the Budget that I am attempting to strike out by this amendment.

If gentlemen will examine the report on page 5, as suggested, they will find that the \$5,530 is to increase the salary of 14 employees of the High Commissioner and to add 5 additional employees. It appears that he already has employed and looking after his comfort in this palace that is provided in Manila approximately 40 employees, and it is desired here to increase the salary of 14 of them and to add 5 more. These employees appear to be largely of a character that minister to the personal comfort and happiness of the High Commissioner, such as caretakers, gardeners, janitors, laborers, and three chauffeurs. The High Commissioner is provided with three chauffeurs at the expense of the Government. Under the Budget estimates alone, as I pointed

out, he has \$28,000 beyond what was provided for the present fiscal year, and it does seem to me he ought to be able to struggle along on that and that the Government ought not to be requested to give \$5,530 above the Budget for the purpose of increasing the salaries of his personal employees or the employees of his office who look after the palace and the grounds, and for the addition of five employees, and it is with the thought in mind that you might be willing to accept this minor economy of approximately \$5,000 in times when we are spending billions very free-heartedly that I have offered the amendment.

My effort is simply to save a little of the money appropriated for the office of the High Commissioner. I see no justification for going above the Budget estimate. It is proposed to furnish him and officials under him a palace at the cost of \$15,000 a year for rent, and it is proposed to build a new palace at a cost, I believe, between one-half and three-quarters of a million dollars, and this at a time when we are fixing to get out of the Philippines and turn the country back to its own people. These matters are extravagances, from my point of view; and while I am not trying by this amendment to correct the major portion of these unwarranted expenditures, I am saying that this small item of increase for additional employees and for increase of salary over the Budget estimate should be stricken out. The proposed expenditure for a new palace is not in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to relate a few facts. There was asked, and reasonable justification was made for, \$18,760 for these various positions to which the gentleman's amendment refers, and certain other positions. After due consideration, the committee cut the amount from \$18,760 to \$5,530.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. No; not at this time.

The gentleman from Georgia spoke of increases, but he did not speak of decreases. There was an increase of 10 in the number of positions, but there was a decrease in the same number, 10. I ask you to follow me just a minute as I refer to the report. Six American clerks at an average of \$3,060 each instead of \$2,850; 4 messengers at \$407 each instead of 6 messengers at \$200 each; 2 American caretakers at \$1,500 each; 12 gardeners, janitors, and laborers at \$240 each instead of 7 at \$286 each.

The committee heard the High Commissioner himself in support of these items. Mr. McNutt has no personal interest in them. He is leaving the islands October 1. He said it made no difference at all to him personally whether or not we approved his recommendations; that he was there as the servant of the United States Government to run his job as the law contemplates, and that his task, or his successor's, could be performed more efficiently and effectively if provision were made for the staff of his office after the manner proposed by him to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 16, noes 32.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS
RIVERS AND HARBORS

To be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and to remain available until expended:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Debris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by

the act approved March 1, 1893 (33 U. S. C., 661); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 45 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C., 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing as may be authorized by the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress, and for the purchase (not to exceed \$173,340) of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats, for official use: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, nor for any work upon or incident to the project to extend the channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony Falls, \$70,-020,000, and, in addition, there is hereby reappropriated for the objects embraced by this paragraph \$24,000,000, or such lesser sum as may remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, of the appropriations "Emergency relief, War, Corps of Engineers, flood control, general (act July 19, 1937), 1938," and "Emergency relief, War, Corps of Engineers, flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries (act July 19, 1937), 1938": *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1939 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the actual expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the congresses and of the commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning with the proviso in line 9, page 7, and ending with the figures "1938" in line 21 reading as follows:

Provided, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, nor for any work upon or incident to the project to extend the channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony Falls, \$70,-020,000, and, in addition, there is hereby reappropriated for the objects embraced by this paragraph \$24,000,000, or such lesser sum as may remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, of the appropriations "Emergency Relief, War, Corps of Engineers, Flood Control, General (act July 19, 1937), 1938," and "Emergency Relief, War, Corps of Engineers, Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries (act July 19, 1937), 1938."

On the ground that this is legislation on an appropriation bill not coming within the purpose and purview of the Holman rule, that it is general in nature and exceeds the authority of this act and may influence other moneys appropriated by this Congress carrying over even into the public-works program.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] desire to be heard?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order from line 9, following the word "*Provided*" on down to and including the words "St. Anthony Falls", in line 13. I concede the point of order to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] limit his point of order to the language indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I limit my point of order to the words suggested by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: Page 7, line 9, after the word "Use", insert "": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, nor for any work upon or incident to the project to extend the channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony Falls."

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota to the committee amendment: Strike out of the committee amendment the following words: "nor for any work upon or incident to the project to extend the channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony Falls."

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes inasmuch as this is a rather technical subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered strikes out the words on page 7, lines 11 to 13, "nor for any work upon or incident to the project to extend the channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony Falls." The reason I offer the amendment striking out that language is because I believe the Committee on Appropriations in effect is legislating rather than appropriating. Myself and others have asked for an appropriation for the completion of this project, which was authorized by Public, No. 392, passed by this Congress and signed by the President last year. Under this authorization \$102,000 has already been spent in drawing plans and making preliminary surveys, both engineering and geological, in the city of Minneapolis to extend the 9-foot channel 4.8 miles farther up into the city of Minneapolis where the industries are located.

It is a peculiar thing that in this program the city of Minneapolis has had to fight for 8 years down here to get hooked onto or connected with the 9-foot-channel program from St. Louis to Minneapolis. Minneapolis is a city having a population of 464,356 people, according to the last census. With the exception of our sister city, St. Paul, Minneapolis has a greater population by 50,000 than the following cities on the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Minneapolis: Hastings, Red Wing, Winona, La Crosse, Dubuque, Clinton, Rock Island, Davenport, Muscatine, Moline, Fort Madison, Burlington, Keokuk, Quincy, and Alton.

These are cities along the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Minneapolis, the latter having a population of 464,356, as I previously stated. The combined population of all the other cities served along that river is only 415,000. It does not look to me like good business or even good horse sense to have a blind alley going all the way from St. Louis to Minneapolis, then leave Minneapolis out of the picture with its flour mills and that great distributing area of the Northwest right at its door.

The Republican administration first authorized this job and spent \$5,000,000. When Franklin Roosevelt was elected President, in July 1934 he made a personal survey trip upon that river. He has espoused the program and the New Deal has spent \$135,000,000 on this job in addition to the \$5,000,000 spent by a former Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, the Government today has \$140,000,000 invested. The annual interest on that investment is \$4,230,000 and I may say this is interest on the investment alone. It is within \$200,000 of the four and one-half million dollars that you are allocating in this bill for the completion of the job, but you are not completing the job. By this kind of language you are shutting the door.

I am informed that under the language of this bill no money under the public spending program can be spent on that project in Minneapolis. I received this information from the War Department. The question was first raised by two railroad attorneys before the subcommittee, and I am not saying anything against them because they are citizens and are entitled to be heard. The subject matter was put in

the bill and this city with a half million population and the Northwest generally was not given a chance. By the language of this proposed amendment you are in effect striking out work involving 8 years of preliminary studies and surveys by the Army engineers.

Now, may I say a word on the question of legislating by an appropriation bill?

There is a letter here from John L. Schley, major general, Chief of Engineers, to Harry Woodring, Secretary of War, as late as February 26, 1938, and in concluding the letter, General Schley states, "In view of the terms of the item of law quoted above, no further action by Congress appears to be necessary."

We went before the committee and asked for the money. We did not get the money, but in addition to not getting the money we got a sort of an anomalous condition, a set of words which nullifies all the work and all the effort put forth by Minneapolis and the farm organizations of the Northwest to get into this Mississippi River improvement program. We are part and parcel of the whole set-up, of the Missouri River system, of the whole Mississippi system, and of the Ohio system. There are 21 States that border and shore line these rivers, as against 23 States bordering on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

We do not get any money under this bill. Since we do not get any money, why should we get this very unusual honor? Why should we be singled out alone of all the projects passed by this Congress for this sort of consideration and this sort of language? I believe my amendment should be adopted and this provision should be stricken from the bill, in all fairness, in all justice, and in all honesty.

Another point that might be raised is that if this job is completed from St. Louis to Minneapolis and the New Deal will have invested \$156,000,000 when the present authorized funds have been expended, and you have created 26 shining, scintillating, perpetual monuments of steel and concrete in the shape of dams across the Mississippi, and you leave Minneapolis, a city of over a half million people today, out of the picture, although it is larger than all the other towns on the river put together, you are not doing a very smart thing or a very businesslike thing. These monuments are made out of concrete and steel. They will be perpetual monuments to folly, if this condition is not corrected. Just think of it, 700 miles or river, with 26 locks and dams, a veritable blind alley.

You can bring your barges past all these smaller cities and towns but when you bring them up to the big elevators of the Northwest at Minneapolis, up to the flour mills where we are milling 6,000,000 barrels of flour a year, up to the point where the railroads pick up and carry into the Northwest, there you have erected a wall. There you have this situation, a sort of a blind alley. In fact, you might call it a program dedicated to the headless horseman of Sleepy Hollow.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. I agree with what the gentleman has stated in regard to setting Minneapolis on this waterway. Minneapolis is the grain market for the Northwest—Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana. When you shut off Minneapolis you shut off the farmers of the Northwest from the benefit of this river traffic. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. We have been fighting for 8 years for this project. It is endorsed by farm organizations, by the business organizations of Minneapolis, and by the labor organizations. The two railroad lawyers who came before the committee are from the city of St. Paul, but they did not raise a voice against any works in the city of St. Paul on this river. Why should they object at this time?

This is the most onerous thing of all. Presumably we are going into a spending program, and I probably will

vote for it. Why should we tie the hands of the War Department and the Army engineers from using this money on a sensible and a good project?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership of this House will understand what is involved in this proposal of my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. The Mississippi River is navigable to the municipal docks in the city of Minneapolis. There is a 9-foot channel to the municipal docks in the city of Minneapolis. The proposal of the gentleman who has offered the amendment provides for the Mississippi River being made navigable a further distance of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 miles above the present municipal docks of the city of Minneapolis. It would be necessary to build at least two dams and other construction work in order to make the river navigable above St. Anthony Falls this distance of $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 miles, and it would cost approximately \$3,000,000. I maintain they have navigation now to the city of Minneapolis, and what is the necessity of this further extension?

Naturally, the railroads that have erected buildings abutting the river and constructed bridges across the river would object to having to rebuild them. At least two of them are now in receivership. These bridges that it would be necessary to reconstruct or alter in one way or another, and there are eight of them across the river, would cost \$1,774,000. The city of Minneapolis and the railroads would have to do that work. I say they would have to do that work, but, as a matter of fact, the Federal Government would have to do it, because they would have to come to the Federal Government to get the money.

Now, at the time this committee wrote up this bill there was no report from the Engineer Corps of the Army. Since then there has been one, and let me read you some excerpts from prior reports of the Engineer Corps of the Army, statements that have been made in the past as to the advisability of doing this work.

Here is Public Document No. 137, Seventy-second Congress, page 48, where it is stated:

It is therefore concluded that the difficult work required to carry navigation above St. Anthony Falls is not justified at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Not now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman give me the date of that report? Was it not 6 years ago?

Mr. COLLINS. I am going to give you one later than that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman give me the report as of February 26, 1938?

Mr. COLLINS. I have stated that this is House Document No. 137, Seventy-second Congress, page 48, and here is another one of February 20, 1936, a communication of J. N. Hodges, colonel, Corps of Engineers:

The principal ground upon which an adverse conclusion was based was that the present terminal is capable of enlargement to handle greatly in excess of the present traffic and the extension project should await definite demonstration through more complete uses of the existing terminal space at Minneapolis and St. Paul of the need of the proposed improvement sufficient to warrant the United States in undertaking the extension.

Now, what do the business people of the city of St. Paul have to say about it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, here is a resolution that was adopted:

Whereas it has been represented to the joint committee representing the Minneapolis Traffic Association, the Taxpayers' Association, and the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association by written evidence of the city planning engineer and by additional oral assurances from others that the building of two locks and

the opening of a 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis by the United States Government will not require the change of any city or railroad bridge and will not involve the city of Minneapolis with any expense or additional tax burden, other than the lowering of one water main below the falls of St. Anthony, at a cost not to exceed \$20,000—

And so on—

Resolved, That the undersigned members of the joint committee recommend to their respective organizations, namely, the Minneapolis Traffic Association, the Taxpayers' Association, and the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association that they approve and support the building of two locks and the opening of a 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis by the Federal Government on condition that there will be no changes or charges or expense imposed in respect to existing railway or city bridges and no expense or additional tax burden to the city of Minneapolis other than the cost of lowering one water main at a cost not to exceed \$20,000.

In other words, if Santa Claus is going to do this, well and good, but if it is going to cost them anything, that is a different matter.

I say to you it is going to cost \$1,774,000 to alter these bridges, and, mind you, these bridges were constructed at a time when there was no navigation at this particular point in that river, or even dreamed of.

This amendment ought to be voted down. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

You know when you start to talk about Government documents and reports, and I am speaking now of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], you should be sure that you have the last reports. The last report of the Army engineers is dated February 26, 1938, and rebuts absolutely everything Mr. COLLINS has said, because he has dug up old reports, and those old reports only prove one thing, and that is that Army engineers when they go into a study do a real job and do not jump off the bridge before they have found out whether there is any water below or not. It only proves that the Army engineers are reliable, and this is their last report:

Under the terms of the authorization, these plans have my approval.

This is February 26, a letter of General Schley. This was also approved by Harry Woodring no later than about a month ago. They have been approved by the entire Board of Army Engineers, and when you say that the city of Minneapolis is not willing to pay for the bridge cost, the city of Minneapolis, on November 15 last fall, sent down 15 city officials who met with the Army engineers and showed a resolution passed by the council pledging 100-percent payment and cooperation for all bridge changes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Not just now. I will yield if I can get more time.

In addition to this, we are legislating on an appropriation bill.

This is now before the Army engineers. The Army engineers are now studying the plan of using the same type of Diesel tugs up there that are used in Chicago, and if that is true your \$1,774,000 argument is beside the point. You will only have to change one bridge in the city of Minneapolis. The point is this: When you start out to do something for a community do it for the community, do not do a halfway job. Do not leave a headless horseman running around; do not let your New Deal administration spend \$156,000,000 and still leave the biggest city of all on the river outside of St. Louis off the river, and when it is said that the channel goes to Minneapolis, that is true. It goes to the south edge of the city, down where the bluffs are 125 feet high, where you cannot get down. The whole industrial part of the city is above St. Anthony Falls, and if you are going to make this channel a paying proposition and a credit to the New Deal you have to have the northwest tonnage in this job to put it over.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman knows that Minneapolis has built docks down there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Yes; Minneapolis has kept its word. We were asked by the Army engineers to show

our confidence in this program. The city of Minneapolis has already spent \$1,000,000 building a terminal below that nobody can use. You cannot get trucks or trains down there; you practically have to handle your goods three or four times, and the city stands ready to scrap that program, and I say that if you cannot give us any money, then take this language out of the bill so that we can get on with our work, and get the money at the proper time. I do not question the right of the committee to cut money out of a bill, but I honestly question the right of an appropriation committee to put riders on the bill after hearing only two railroad lawyers, and I know that the New Deal does not mean that kind of a parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. As I understand this whole paragraph, it appropriates this money to the Corps of Engineers and gives them carte blanche to spend the money as they see fit, almost. About the only limitation upon the activities of the Corps of Engineers is the language to which the gentleman has referred. It seems to me that is conclusive evidence of the fact that the committee knows that the Corps of Engineers would, if given authority, go on and carry out this project, because they believe in it, and it seems to me that conclusively proves that the Corps of Engineers approves of this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. This House and the Senate have done a wonderful job on this program. There are a lot of guaranties in the bill passed last year. The following language is provided in the authorization bill of last year, Public, No. 392:

Final approval of the plan by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as is necessary to provide adequate terminal facilities for Minneapolis.

Then the engineers came back in their report of February 26, 1938, and use language to the effect that this plan is contingent upon a final plan on bridge alterations worked out by the Federal Government, the railroads involved, and by the city of Minneapolis, and we are working on a program now. We know that we have to compromise in order to work this plan out, and it has been in the spirit of compromise all the way. Here are 8 years of work to be destroyed by some unhappy words. I think the committee could not have known about it because they have not participated in all these deliberations over a period of 8 years. They heard only two railroad lawyers and what they had to say, and I think the House ought to accept my amendment and take those words out of the bill, and leave the situation where it is, for compromise between the city of Minneapolis and the Army engineers to work out this solution of the whole program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and the amendment to the amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman who spoke in favor of this amendment evidently thinks that there is only one city on the Mississippi River. The Government has spent about \$140,000,000 so far on this project of making a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. In this year's Budget there is allocated the sum of \$4,965,000 to further carry out the project. There are 26 locks and dams on the Mississippi River that are already included in this project. There are 26 cities on the Mississippi that are getting the benefit from this deep channel.

The subcommittee that had this matter in charge did not listen merely to a couple of railroad lawyers, as intimated by the gentleman from Minnesota, but Representatives in Congress came before our committee, and the gentleman from Minneapolis, who has interested himself in favor of this project, also came before our committee. As was told to you by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], this project goes up to the lower end of Minneapolis.

It goes to the docks at the lower end of the city. To complete the canalization of the river from that point to the upper end of the city, a distance of about 3½ miles, will cost in the neighborhood of \$8,000,000. We think there should be further study of this proposition, especially in view of the fact that the division and allocation of the expenses involved in changing and altering the bridges across the river, changes which will have to be made if the project is carried out, have not been made. This additional expense will amount to \$1,700,000. The city is willing to do its part, I presume, with respect to municipal bridges, but nothing has been agreed upon in regard to the railroad bridges or who shall pay for that change. This committee, in its good judgment, thought it would be proper to carry this on over this year with the \$4,565,000 appropriation for this work in the present bill, and let the project to go above St. Anthonys Falls go over for further study as to whether the Government of the United States shall pay nearly \$8,000,000 additional. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not at this time incur this additional expense without further study.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Is it not true that no money is appropriated in this bill for this project; in other words, that the thing the gentleman is doing is to blackball this project?

Mr. TERRY. There is included in the appropriation for 1939 for the project of the 9-foot channel the sum of \$4,565,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. That is below this particular point.

Mr. TERRY. That is in the total project. There is nothing in this bill specifically to provide for carrying the project above St. Anthonys Falls.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota) there were—ayes 22, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was on his feet seeking recognition when the Chair put the last question. The Chair thinks that in fairness to the gentleman from Wisconsin the point of order should be overruled. The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Wisconsin objects to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my first intention was to offer an amendment to this bill increasing the lump sum to the Engineer Corps under this provision for the purpose of making

sufficient provision for the continued deepening of the Barge Canal in New York State. The Barge Canal in New York State is an active canal carrying tonnage to the amount of 6,000,000 tons a year, 90 percent of which is interstate. Some 3 years ago the Congress authorized \$27,000,000 for its deepening to a 12-foot navigable depth. That was to be expended at the rate of \$5,000,000 a year. May I say that this canal goes through a populous section. Relief is a present necessity in that locality; yet here we find the committee, according to its schedule, has cut down this appropriation something over \$3,000,000.

The project is entirely economic, sound, and is necessary in the present situation of that locality. I am merely taking the time of the House now so as to advise the Members of the situation, for I make the prediction that when this bill comes back from the other body that this amount will be increased. I do not think it will be done here, but over in the other body they have a way of doing these things when they are based on sound economy and national and local necessity. So at that time, not now, I am going to ask your intelligent and sympathetic consideration of the increase they make over there. Thank you. [Applause.]

I am including in the Record, pursuant to the permission of the House, a letter received today from the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. It is as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
DIVISION OF ENGINEERING,
Albany, N. Y., April 19, 1938.

Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CULKIN: News dispatches today contain information that a bill presented to the House for river and harbor work included an item of \$1,750,000 for the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway (New York State Barge Canal Improvement).

For the past 3 years there has been allotted to New York State \$5,000,000 to carry on the work of the improvement, total estimated cost of which is \$27,000,000.

I believe there should be made available for the present year an allotment of at least \$5,000,000. With any lesser amount the program of the improvement will be seriously delayed and navigation interests will suffer. Construction plant and personnel have been assembled in this area to carry out the improvement at the rate of \$5,000,000 annually. If funds are reduced this construction plant and personnel will disperse, and to reassemble the plant and personnel for this work will cause expense and delay.

The engineering forces of the State and the United States in charge of this work are both organized to carry out work on the basis of \$5,000,000 annually. The lesser allotment would mean a disruption of both organizations.

While the work already accomplished has provided material improvements to the canal channel and that navigation has been undoubtedly benefited, it is a fact that until the project is completed, navigation interests cannot realize its full benefits. If any portion of the canal is less than full project depth, the loading of boats and the speed of travel will be materially restricted. It is therefore highly essential that the improvement be carried through to completion as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

T. F. FARRELL, Chief Engineer.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: Page 7, line 16, strike out "June 30, 1938" and insert in lieu thereof "April 21, 1938, which subsequently may be ascertained to have been unobligated on such date."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control: For the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 1570-1595; 50 Stat. 517-518, 876-881), and the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 806), including printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, the purchase (not to exceed \$33,250) of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles

and motorboats for official use, and not to exceed \$3,000,000 for preliminary examinations and surveys of flood-control projects authorized by law, \$82,000,000: *Provided*, That \$3,000,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred and made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of flood-control projects authorized by law, including the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books and periodicals, printing and binding, rent in the District of Columbia, purchase (not to exceed \$75,000) of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motorboats, and for other necessary expenses.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to the item of \$82,000,000 carried in this paragraph of the bill. It is often said in this House that the group of Representatives who are particularly interested in reclamation and the group of States which are absolutely dependent upon reclamation get a lot more than we are entitled to. I rise at this time to call attention to an excerpt from the President's message, which is quoted on page 11 of the report on this bill, as follows:

I recommend an appropriation of \$37,000,000 over and above estimates for the immediate undertaking of flood control and reclamation work, to be expended on projects already authorized by this or former Congresses.

We from the reclamation States take the position that there should be just as much emphasis placed on the word "reclamation" in connection with this \$37,000,000 as on the words "flood control," but we find in this bill that the flood-control people have taken the entire \$37,000,000 recommended by the President and have appropriated the entire \$37,000,000 for flood control, leaving not one dime for reclamation. I do not think there is a Member on the floor from a reclamation State who will object to the taking of the entire \$37,000,000 for flood control.

I call attention to the fact that not one dime that is spent for flood control will ever come back to the Treasury of the United States, except as it promotes the general welfare of the whole country. By reason of that fact I am in sympathy with flood control and will support this item. I call attention further to the fact that not one dime is appropriated for reclamation that is not contracted to be repaid into the Federal Treasury, and ultimately will be repaid.

We from the reclamation States are willing to go along with your flood control. We are willing to give you the entire \$37,000,000 recommended by the President; but we ask, Mr. Chairman, when the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill comes back here for consideration in a few days, and when the question comes up of adding a few million dollars to the reclamation fund, every dime of which comes from the reclamation and the public-land States, that we may have reciprocated on your part the same generosity we are willing to extend today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that more than \$37,000,000 of this money appropriated for flood control will be spent in States classed as reclamation States, including California, New Mexico, Oregon, and other reclamation States?

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Those States will get more than \$37,000,000 out of the flood-control money.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. But there is a group of States in the Rocky Mountains that does not get any flood control and its very existence is dependent upon reclamation. Every dime that goes into the reclamation fund comes from the reclamation States; so that next week when there is brought in here the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill, we want the flood-control Members to give us the same treatment that we today are willing to extend to you and that we always extend in the consideration of appropriations for flood control.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations a question. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings, and on page 150 I notice a long list of figures. There is listed a certain group of figures and it is stated that they are based upon a \$1,000,000 survey. Then there is another list of figures and it is stated that those figures are based on the \$4,000,000 survey. I also notice that the figures are alike in some cases and in other cases they are different. What is the reason for those two columns there? What is the significance of those two columns?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. The first column is a break-down based upon the Budget estimate. The second column would be the break-down if the appropriation were made on the basis of the estimate, except that \$4,000,000 instead of \$1,000,000, would be applied to survey work.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I stated before, I notice that the figures in the two columns running down the first page are about the same. Going on down the second page there is some difference. I do not quite understand the gentleman's explanation yet. Where is the total of \$82,000,000 reflected? In which one of these sets of figures is that \$82,000,000 reflected? Neither column of figures, so far as I am able to determine, make up a total of \$82,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. There is no break-down of the \$32,000,000 added by the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The figures are not very helpful then as against the total of \$82,000,000?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. No; the employment of the additional amount remains to be determined by the Army engineers, subject to approval by the President.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. They are only probative and valuable, then, whenever you consider the \$50,000,000 appropriation, is that right?

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority Members of the House may be interested in knowing that information was given me today from a reliable gentleman to the effect that an employee of the Labor Board is making a false and unfair attack not upon a Republican Member but upon a Member on the majority side.

Sometime ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] submitted to this House information concerning the activities of Miss Dorothea de Schweinitz, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in St. Louis. He charged that employees in her office had told workers they must join a particular labor union. She denied it. Later, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] produced affidavits, as well as sworn testimony, that she did urge St. Louis workers to abandon one union and join another.

Since that time, Miss de Schweinitz has been contacting labor leaders in St. Louis, asking them to help defeat Mr. ANDERSON for reelection because he is "unfriendly" to labor. Yet Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, requested that organization to support Mr. ANDERSON and endorsed him.

However the Members of the House may feel regarding the activities of the N. L. R. B. in favoring the C. I. O. to the detriment of the A. F. of L., is it not about time that the House should take some action to protect its Members from political attacks made by an employee of that Board? Is it not time that the House, the majority leadership, recognize the fact that those who venture to criticize the C. I. O. or the improper activities of the N. L. R. B. are protected from political retaliation?

Republicans—I speak only for myself—expect no such protection from such activities, but surely the majority, which refuses to amend the Wagner law, which takes no action against the partisan activities of the N. L. R. B., should protect Democrats at least from these unfair and untrue attacks.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] is known here on the floor of the House as a friend of labor, and an employee of the National Labor Relations Board should not be permitted to crucify him because of his fearless exposure of some of its reprehensible practices.

I speak of this only so you may know not only that the activities of the employees of that Board are directed to the securing of members for one particular union but that the efforts of one of the employees is directed toward defeating a Member on the majority side.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. St. Claire, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9544) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8993) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives does a good job I like to say so. Today we have passed the last of the regular appropriation bills. [Applause.] This is the 21st of April. Only one time since the enactment of the Norris or so-called lame-duck amendment has the House completed the appropriation bills earlier than the 21st of April, and then they were completed 2 days earlier, on April 19.

It is my intention before the session closes not only to call attention to the diligence of the House at this session with

reference to appropriation bills but to place in the RECORD a list of the bills, and a discussion of the major bills, that have been passed in this session of Congress. I believe this session of Congress in these less than 4 months will measure up to if not surpass, as far as passing upon major legislation is concerned, any session of Congress of which I have been a Member. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill and include therein a letter received from the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a list of projects for needed Army housing, as furnished by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein certain excerpts from the so-called National Consumers News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio address by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions adopted by the Farmers Equity Union Convention at Chippewa Falls, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the majority leader what is on the calendar for Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet been informed whether the Committee on the District of Columbia has any business to consider. If they have not, or if they have some business and it is completed, we will take up the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the one which includes the so-called Gilbertsville Dam.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Gilbertsville Dam, and the amendment inserted by the Senate with reference to confirmation of all employees receiving salaries above \$5,000.

I may say to the gentleman that it is the intention to take up on Tuesday the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, about which I understand there is no controversy, and follow that with the so-called Scott bill, having to do with the retirement of naval officers.

On Wednesday we will call the calendar of committees, and the call rests with the Committee on Patents. When we complete the consideration of the Scott bill on Tuesday we hope to take up the rivers and harbors authorization bill for general debate and complete its consideration on either Wednesday or Thursday. I may say further that if we have time late in the week and can get a rule it is the intention to consider the so-called increase of judges bill. That is the program for next week.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman realize that with respect to the Interior Department appropriation bill there is coming back in disagreement an amendment which will take out of the Treasury and put into the reclamation fund approximately \$729,000,000, and that probably that bill will take all the afternoon?

Mr. RAYBURN. I did not know that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and to include therein a letter from the superintendent of public works of New York State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including two short addresses recently delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very short excerpt from a court finding and also from a magazine article regarding Gilbertsville Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Labor has favorably reported Senate 2475, with an amendment. The bill and report will be available in the document room tomorrow morning for the Members who care to see them.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, in a way, that you are sitting in the chair so that the remarks I propose to make will be heard by you in person, and I am also glad of this opportunity to address myself to the House through you.

A week ago I had occasion to make a speech on the floor of this House in which I warned the Congress of the United

States against the un-American activities of subversive movements and their spy system, as well as against the espionage being carried on in the United States. The only answers I have received to my plea came from thousands and thousands of American citizens, as well as many patriotic organizations.

The speech that I made last week, Mr. Speaker, is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1938, at page 5336. A part of that speech I will now quote, Mr. Speaker. I stated on page 5336, and I want the Members to listen to this carefully:

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a celebration on April 20 throughout this country. A celebration for what? To celebrate the conquest of Austria by Mr. Hitler and the birthday of the great "fuhrer." I warn the country and I warn the Congress that there will be bloodshed in those sections of the country where this movement gets under way. There will be trouble with these Nazi bunds, which, as I stated sometime ago, total over 450,000.

Unfortunately this prediction, Mr. Speaker, came true last night when a riot took place in my city between the American Legion boys and the alien Nazi storm troopers. There was bloodshed, and I again predict that there will be bloodshed in every section of the country where the Nazi bunds are carrying on their un-American activities.

You do not have to be much of a prophet to understand that. When I predicted the condition that would arise yesterday, it was from information from American Legionnaires and other good Americans who were warning Congress that unless something is done by Congress to investigate this intolerable condition, some of them would take the law in their own hands. That is exactly what happened in New York when dozens of men were hurt and injured, men and women had to be taken to the hospital. It took one hundred-and-some-odd policemen in the city of New York to stop the riot, and at that it took almost 2 hours to do it.

I notice by the press today that the Nazi bund leader or the assistant leader, James Wheeler Hill, who is known as the national secretary, wired Speaker BANKHEAD demanding that I be investigated because I predicted last week what would happen on the 20th of this month, and in that way by inference implying that I arranged the slaughter which took place last night. I assure the Congress and the Speaker that I had no more to do with it than you did. I have simply taken the ordinary deductions from information that I have received, not only from my city, but from the Speaker's city, from the city of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and from cities of many other Members. I say to you that I have the endorsement for an investigation of subversive activities from almost every section of the country. I again warn this Congress, and I appeal to the Speaker of the House, that someone will be responsible if this Congress adjourns without having adopted a proper investigating resolution.

I do not want to come here next year and say "I told you so." I am serving notice upon the Congress now and in serving that notice I know I can safely say that I speak for the American people. Only this morning I noticed a press release in the Washington Times and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read this editorial, which is very brief and to the point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT). Without objection the Clerk will read.

There was no objection and the Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Times of April 21, 1938]

LEGION HEAD DEMANDS BAN ON NAZIS AND ALL "ISMS"

WOBBURN, MASS., April 21.—National Commander Daniel J. Doherty of the American Legion today urged that Nazi-ism, and all other "isms," be barred from the United States.

Declining direct comment on the clash between World War veterans and members of the German-American Bund in New York last night, pending receipt of official reports, Commander Doherty declared:

"I will say this. We of the American Legion are against all subversive activities. I think it is time the American people awakened to the danger from within as well as from without.

"The American Legion has legislation pending in Congress to do away with such subversive organizations. It is time they were outlawed."

With obvious reference to storm troopers uniforms affected at many of the bund meetings, Doherty added:

"I can see no reason for men drilling in uniforms bearing the flag of another nation while purporting to display their Americanism."

"Congress should awaken to the danger and pass legislation prohibiting such organizations as Nazi bund camps—the sooner this is done the sooner we will be rid of the danger to democracy."

"No other country in the world would permit such meetings which, instead of being dictated by free speech, in fact become licensed."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, what actually did happen yesterday? One of the fine Americans, a member of the American Legion, was attacked at a public Nazi bund meeting. When they told the public that they had been waiting for Hitler for 2,000 years and that a democracy means nothing, this member of the American Legion stood up, and, by the way, his name is Matthews, and I do not know who he is, and said, "What is this, an American meeting or a foreign meeting?" or words to that effect, and when he said that a Nazi storm trooper, in uniform, took out a black-jack, or something similar, and struck this American on the head, injuring him severely. Then the fight started. Everyone that participated in this assault on the side of the Nazis was dressed in a foreign uniform and carried dangerous weapons in his pockets. They were fighting Americans in behalf of Hitler, international world enemy No. 1. And we tolerate it, and you tolerate it, and the leadership of this Congress tolerates it, because some Members of Congress want to save a few pennies that might have to be spent for an investigation. Maybe they think that will balance the Budget. If that is the way they are going to balance the Budget, that is, by saving a few pennies while letting this country be destroyed by foreign groups, then I shall go out with a tin bucket and make a collection for an investigation, if that is what they want. In the last month, Mr. Speaker, a Nazi named John B. Unkel, was attacking me through the German subsidized press, calling me all sorts of names.

That very man, on April 8, was arrested as a spy and is now under lock and key as I am informed. As I have stated to you before, hundreds of spies are walking the streets of this city, of your city, of my city, who seek to destroy this Government in one way or another. I am in position to obtain this information had I but the power of subpoena and the power to give immunity to these so-called witnesses who are prepared to give the Department of Justice and the Secret Service the names by which and under which they could pick the spies up and put them in jail, where they properly belong.

I expect another riot pretty soon in Camp Upton. That was one of the first Nazi camps in New York established with German money. During 1917 and the World War this camp was used to train thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands, of American boys to protect democracy and free the world from tyranny. Yet today we find that this very spot has been purchased by Hitler's agents and is being used as a Nazi-Hitler camp. By the way, Mr. Speaker, they have opened a new street in this camp. They are going to dedicate this street as Adolph Hitler Strasse, Adolph Hitler Street, and there is going to be a celebration on that occasion. I have been informed, not only by Legionnaires but other groups of patriots, that if the Government cannot control the situation, if Congress wants to be blind, they will have to do something about it themselves. If Mr. Hill, the acting leader in the absence of Fritz Kuhn, thinks I had something to do with arranging this bloodshed last night, he is wrong. If I had the spiritual power to do such things without my conscious self knowing of it, then indeed it is a strange power. I am not a bit sorry over what happened, except for the Americans that were injured, and I am afraid it is going to happen again in your city and in my city. We cannot let that go on; we must act now.

I hold in my hand a little sort of program. This is a secret program containing pictures of all so-called leaders and all the other Nazi rats we have in this country, in addition to an outline of their duties for the year 1938, the

number of new members they should get in, and the people they should attack; because, if you do not join that bund, if you happen to be a person of German blood and they know you have relatives on the other side, those relatives are going to the concentration camp unless you actually join this movement in this country.

Suppose I tell you that there are over 100 American firms, so-called 100-percent Americans, who have been contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars to make this country a Fascist country! Suppose I tell you, Mr. Speaker—and I want you to hear it—that outstanding firms in this country have contributed, to my own knowledge, thousands of dollars to carry on this menace in this country against the American people, because they have a little interest in Germany and if they do not contribute here they claim that their property in Germany would be confiscated.

Do you not think, Mr. Congressman, that you ought to know something about these things? Do you not think, Mr. Congressman, and you, Mr. Speaker, that you ought to know how much money is being brought into this country for the purpose of destroying your Government? Do you know, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, that Mr. Goebbels, the Propaganda Minister of Germany, has appropriated \$100,000,000 for propaganda purposes, at least \$40,000,000 of which is being used in this country for propaganda which seeks to undermine our form of government?

Are you willing to go back to your constituents and say: "Well, I do not know anything about it?" I have been talking about it for 4 years. When I began talking about it you all thought I was exaggerating. But you have seen it come true every day in the week and every week in the year.

For your information, Mr. Speaker, and for the information of the delegation from New Jersey—and, by the way, the delegation in Congress from Pennsylvania and other States ought to wake up, too—I have a number of resolutions from innumerable groups from all sections of the country demanding that something be done immediately. I say to you that the time will come when your constituents will ask you how you stand on this question, for they ask me every day: "What is my Congressman doing; is he supporting you?"

Mr. Speaker, only a week ago certain Nazi groups in this country purchased another camp in the city or town of Bloomington, State of New Jersey, under the guise of fighting communism. Do we need Hitler to fight communism for Uncle Sam? Is not Uncle Sam capable enough to fight communism in this country? This will make the thirty-first camp in this country. Since when has Hitler become so generous as to spend money to create these camps and an army of a half million to fight communism in another country? Can we not take care of it ourselves? Since when have they the right to come here and tell us how to run our Government and our country? Since when have we allowed them to attack the President of the United States as they did yesterday and other days when they criticized the President and Mr. Hull for the proclamation in reference to the so-called refugees? That, by the way, was the reason the second fight started. Since when have we permitted them to say that our democracy does not mean a thing, while fascism meets with their approval?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has become worse since the treaty has been made with Japan, and I refer to the treaty between Japan, Italy, and Germany. The agents of these countries are working side by side and arm in arm in the United States. They also have the White Russian Fascists joining forces with them. The White Russian Fascists want to destroy the Soviet Government. It is all being hatched in this country. The Nazis want to destroy this country. Japan is trying to destroy the world. Yet we

say it cannot happen here. But it can happen here. It is happening right now under our very noses. I am not so much worried about the Communists as I am about the Fascists. I can handle the Communists and, may I say right here, the Communists and the Fascists are both cousins. It does not make much difference.

Mr. Speaker, we must wake up because every day we read the newspapers, we find that there is some group or another advocating the destruction of democracy and substituting therefor some other form of government. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has introduced a resolution which is now pending before the Rules Committee. Too many Members have been passing the buck. While everybody says, "I am for you 100 percent," nobody does anything about it. Public opinion demands an investigation and public opinion will request that you take some action.

As I stated before, I have endorsements and communications from organizations in your city, Mr. Speaker, from your city, Mr. McCORMACK, from your city, Mr. CULLEN, and from other cities asking me what to do, but I am helpless unless you cooperate with me, and I am sure you will as you have in the past. Unfortunately I got into this investigation because I happened to be chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and these facts were brought to my attention. I would not be true to my oath of office if I did not follow this thing through and advise the country of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I appeal to you. If the Nazis want to investigate me, give them an investigation. I am willing to be investigated. But include in the investigation all the Nazis, all the Communists, all the Fascists, and all the spies. Let us find out by what authority they smuggle uniforms into this country, by what authority they goose-step and "Heil Hitler," click their heels together and threaten the lives of American people if they do not join a bund or some other un-American movement. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH], may extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. CLASON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a resolution passed by the Charles A. Lindbergh Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution passed by the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 9257. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.;

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution providing an additional appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3590. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to make available certain other officers for General Staff duty.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Mr. EICHER's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Monday, April 25, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 10292—trust indentures.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will begin hearings on the general subject of civil-service retirement on Tuesday, April 26, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., in room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10 a. m. Wednesday, April 27, 1938, in room 346, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 9745, to provide for guaranties of collective bargaining in contracts entered into and in the grant or loans of funds by the United States, or any agency thereof, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The Committee on the Library will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 27, 1938, in room 1536, New House Office Building, on H. J. Res. 626—the Columbian Fountain.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs in room 113, House Office Building, Tuesday, April 26, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 10050, which authorizes the legislature of Puerto Rico to create public corporate authorities to undertake slum clearance and projects, to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income, and to issue bonds therefor, to authorize the legislature to provide for financial assistance to such authorities by the government of Puerto Rico and its municipalities, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1257. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1937; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1258. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 9, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Brannan Reservoir, Okla., and levees on Chikaskia River south of Autwine, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1259. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pocomoke River, Md., from Snow Hill to deep water in Pocomoke Sound, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1260. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Choptank River, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1261. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 4, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tedious Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1262. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on reexamination of Chetco Cove, Oreg., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted August 5, 1937, and by resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted March 20, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 655. Joint resolution amending paragraph (4) of subsection (n) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4650. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8700. A bill relating to the retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 2171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3081. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to grant to the city of Fargo, N. Dak., an easement over a certain tract of land owned by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3290. An act to impose additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service in connection with the investigation and control of the venereal diseases; with amendment (Rept. No. 2174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9760. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1899, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of War to permit allotments from the pay of military personnel and permanent civilian employees under certain conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 10004. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Mount Olivet Cemetery Co., in the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10120. A bill to amend section 35 of an act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 658. Joint resolution for the designation of a street or avenue to be known as "Maine Avenue"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2179). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 10312. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and to define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes", approved September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960, Sixty-fifth Congress); without amendment (Rept. No. 2180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6246. A bill to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character; without amendment (Rept. No. 2181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. S. 2475. An act to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2986. An act to amend section 6 of the act approved May 27, 1936 (49 U. S. Stat. L. 1380); with amendment (Rept. No. 2183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3351. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1915, as amended, the act of June 23, 1936, section 4551 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of material of the Bureau of Lighthouses to the Sea Scout Department of the Boy Scouts of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9707. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on the District of Columbia: H. R. 9556. A bill to incorporate the United States Power Squadrons, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 247. Joint resolution authorizing William Bowie, captain (retired), United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, to accept and wear decoration of the order of Orange Nassau, bestowed by the Government of the Netherlands; without amendment (Rept. No. 2185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 10340) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 10341) amending the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10342) to provide for a preliminary survey and examination of Allapatchee River, also known as Alligator Creek, a tributary to Punta Gorda Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10343) to extend the provisions of the civil-service laws to full-time chaplains in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10344) to provide for the restoration of forfeited rights under veterans' compensation and pension laws and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEAVY: A bill (H. R. 10345) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for matching equally the sums expended by the States for aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 10346) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10347) providing for a survey with preliminary estimates of cost for the proposed construction of railroad and automobile truck tunnels across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 10348) to amend section 313 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 10349) to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 10350) to provide aeronautical training at land-grant colleges, high schools, and private institutions, in the same manner as now provided for military education, and to further promote civil and military flying by establishing the United States Aeronautical Academy for the training of cadets and officers in military aeronautics, said academy to be upon a basis of equal dignity, importance, and scientific and tactical standing as the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 10351) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEAN: A bill (H. R. 10352) for the purchase of Boxwood Hall, Elizabeth, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10353) to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 10354) to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured from the Government on Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10355) to transfer, assign, and convey to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a certain tract of land, containing about 6½ acres, situate in Tinicum Town-

ship, Delaware County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10356) to amend sections 811 (b) and 907 (c) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10357) to alter the ratio of appropriations to be apportioned to the States for public employment offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 10358) to fix the requirements of capital, surplus, and undivided profits of banks in proportion to their deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOREN: A bill (H. R. 10359) providing for per capita payments to the Seminole Indians in Oklahoma from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBETH: Resolution (H. Res. 469) authorizing the printing of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 659) to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third Pan American Highway Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 660) to authorize and request the President of the United States to invite the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics to hold its seventh general assembly in the United States during the calendar year 1939, and to invite foreign governments to participate in that general assembly; and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses necessary for participation by the United States in the meeting; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 661) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10360) for the relief of Beltrami Consolidated Abstract Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 10361) for the relief of George Cravey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 10362) for the relief of Patrick Connelly, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10363) for the relief of Maj. Noe C. Killian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10364) granting a pension to Oscar K. Shell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10365) for the relief of Ben Willie Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10366) granting an increase of pension to Katharine H. Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10367) for the relief of William J. Murr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10368) granting a pension to Ben Harrison Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 10369) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Bobenhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHELCHER: A bill (H. R. 10370) for the relief of Phil S. Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4890. By Mr. CLASON: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, in opposition to the inclusion of furni-

ture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements made with foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4891. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Monthly Forum, of Chicago, Ill., Nan Brody, secretary, pointing out that it is desirable that the Federal Government should promote culture, literature, and the appreciation thereof, and therefore urging that the Congress pass the Coffee bill (H. R. 9102) to create a Federal Bureau of Fine Arts; to the Committee on Education.

4892. Also, resolution of the South End Improvement Club, of Mercer Island, Wash., Mrs. Alfred J. Fleury, secretary, urging the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Works Progress Administration to increase the allocation of nonlabor funds for the Works Progress Administration purposes to \$15 per man-month; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4893. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Federal Department of States in opposition to the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements made with foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4894. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. H. A. Terrell and 39 others, of Syracuse, Kans., urging the enactment of a law to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by the press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4895. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, Rome, N. Y., concerning the revision of the capital-gains tax and undistributed-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4896. Also, petition of Philippines Post, No. 1164, American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the passage of legislation toward the end that all Filipino World War veterans may automatically become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4897. Also, petition of the Wholesale Tobacco Distributors Association of New York, concerning the Senate amendment to the revenue bill, placing a tax on paper matches, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4898. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide all necessary aids to night air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4899. Also, resolution of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, relative to Federal tax on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4900. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to memorializing Congress concerning the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4901. Also, resolution of the Southern California District Council, No. 4, of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific Coast, relative to the adoption of House bill 8430; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4902. Also, resolution of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4903. Also, resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, relative to memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to enact House bill 9256, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4904. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Central Labor Council of Buffalo, urging Congress to appropriate at least \$5,000,000,000 for speeding up and completing Public Works Administration and Works Progress Administration projects; a liberalization of rules governing unemployed persons eligible for employment; and at least 10 percent of all moneys spent by Public Works Administration and Works Progress Administration be spent for skilled labor at prevailing rate of wages; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4905. Also, resolution of the James T. Bergen Post, No. 39, of the American Legion, requesting the Secretary of the

Navy to name one of the cruisers about to be constructed *Amsterdam* in respect to our pioneer Americans and to the credit of our industrial progress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4906. Also, resolution of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, Long Island, earnestly requesting the early enactment into law of House bill 2717; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4907. Also, resolution of the Queens County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that when veterans employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard are discharged through lack of work and later return to the yard after a period of 30 days has elapsed, that they shall return with none of the benefits or credits impaired; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4908. Also, resolution of the Philippines Post, No. 1164, of the American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation toward the end that all Filipino World War veterans now excluded in the extension of Veterans' Act (Public Law, 388) may automatically become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4909. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the American Legion, New York City, advocating the retention of all post exchanges without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4910. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Wenatchee Central Labor Council, of Wenatchee, Wash., requesting and urging modifications and amendment of existing Works Progress Administration legislation governing classifications and wage rates to Works Progress Administration workers and urging that there be only one classification for all Works Progress Administration workers; to the Committee on Labor.

4911. By Mr. PFEIFER: Telegram of the Wholesale Tobacco Distributors Association of New York, Inc., New York City, opposing Senate recommendation for additional tax on paper matches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4912. Also, petition of the Paper Plate and Bag Makers Union, Local No. 107, New York City, concerning the recovery program recently submitted by the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4913. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Shinglehouse, Pa., favoring House bill 10058; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4914. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. Bradshaw and others of Wood County, Ohio, concerning advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4915. Also, petition of the city of Manchester, N. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4199, the General Welfare Act of 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 20, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 21, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I feel the situation demands that I announce the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call to secure one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bankhead	Brown, N. H.	Byrnes
Andrews	Barkley	Bulkeley	Caraway
Ashurst	Bilbo	Bulow	Chavez
Austin	Bone	Burke	Clark
Bailey	Borah	Byrd	Copeland

Davis	Hayden	Maloney	Schwellenbach
Dieterich	Herring	Miller	Sheppard
Donahay	Holt	Milton	Shipstead
Duffy	Hughes	Minton	Smathers
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Smith
Frazier	King	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
George	Lee	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Gibson	Lewis	Nye	Truman
Gillette	Lodge	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Logan	Overton	Vandenberg
Green	Loung	Pittman	Van Nuys
Guffey	Lundeen	Pope	Wagner
Hale	McCarran	Radcliffe	Walsh
Harrison	McGill	Reynolds	Wheeler
Hatch	McNary	Schwartz	White

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. REAMES] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained in their respective States on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, and is, therefore, detained from the Senate today.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent in the performance of official duty as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3915. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Tidewater Construction Corporation;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of George Shade and Vava Shade;

H. R. 5731. An act for the relief of Ruth Rule, a minor;

H. R. 5737. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of George W. Hall against the United States;

H. R. 5793. An act for the relief of Nathaniel M. Harvey, as administrator of the estate of Josephine Fontana, deceased;

H. R. 6370. An act for the relief of John Calareso, a minor;

H. R. 8993. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9544. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.